THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW.

VOL. CXII.

THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OR

CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR

JULY, 1860. . . . OCTOBER, 1860.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. CXII.

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, AND ROBERTS, LONDON;
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,
EDINBURGH.

1860.

Lakewood Public Library
Date 23.7
Accn. No. 7543

CONTENTS OF No. 227.

Page

ART. I.—1. De la Baisse probable de l'Or: des conséquences commerciales et sociales qu'elle peut avoir, et des mesures qu'elle provoque. Par Michel Chevalier, 8vo. Paris: 1859.

2. On the probable Fall in the Value of Gold, &c. By Michel Chevalier, &c. Translated by Richard Cobden, Esq. London: 1859, ... 1

II.—The Diaries and Correspondence of the Right Hon. George Rose, containing original Letters of the most distinguished Statesmen of his day. Edited by the Rev. Leveson Vernon Harcourt. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1860, ... 34

III.—Histoire de la Réunion de la Lorraine à la France. Par M. le Comte D'Haussonville. 4 vols. Paris: 1859, ... 59

IV.—1. Siluria; the History of the Oldest Fossiliferous Rocks and their Foundations, with a Brief Sketch of the Distribution of Gold over the Surface of the Earth. By Sir Roderick Impey Murchison. Third Edition (including The Silurian System). London: 1859.

2. On the Geological Structure of the North of Scotland, &c. &c. By Sir Roderick I. Murchison. (Transactions of the British Association 1855, Tr. Sect., p. 85.; Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society for 1858—1859.)

3. New Geological Map of the Highlands (Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society, May, 1860), 87

V.—1. Note Circulaire adressée par le Gouvernement des Romagnes à ses agents à l'étranger. Boulogne: 1859.

2. The Court of Rome and the Gospel. Translated from the Italian of the Marquis Roberto d'Azeglio, with a Preface by A. H. Layard, D.C.L. London: 1859.

3. Le Pape et le Congrès. Paris: 1859.

4. La Papauté et l'Empire. Par F. Laurent. Paris et Londres: 1860.

5. Rome: its Rulers and its Institutions. By John Francis Maguire, M.P. London: 1859.

6. La Question Romaine. Par Edmund About. Paris: 1859, 101

Page

VI.—Revolutions in English History. By Robert Vaughan, D. D. Vol. I., Revolutions of Race. London: 1859, ... 136

VII.—Memoir of the Life of Ary Scheffer. By Mrs. Grote. London: 1860, ... 161

VIII.—1. La Vérité sur la Russie. Par Le Prince Pierre Dolgoroukow. Paris: 1860.
2. La Russie et Les Russes. Par N. Tourgueneff. Paris: 1847.
3. Un Dernier Mot sur l'Emancipation des Serfs en Russie. Par N. Tourgueneff. Paris: 1860.
4. La Question du Servage en Russie. Par M. L. Wolowski. Revue des Deux Mondes, Juillet et Août. 1858.
5. The Russians of the South. By Shirley Brooks. London: 1854.
6. Russland unter Alexander II. Nicolajewitsch. 1855–1860. Leipsig: 1860, . . . 175

IX.—1. Briefe von Alexander von Humboldt an Varnhagen von Ense, aus den Jahren 1827 bis 1858. Nebst Auszügen aus Varnhagens Tagebüchern und Briefen von Varnhagen und andern an Humboldt. Fünfte Auflage, Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus: 1860.
2. Letters of Alexander von Humboldt, written between the years 1827 and 1858, to Varnhagen von Ense. Together with Extracts from Varnhagen's Diaries, and Letters from Varnhagen and others to Humboldt. Authorized translation from the German, with Explanatory Notes, and a full Index of Names. London: 1860, ... 213

X.—Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire. Par M. A. Thiers. Vol. XVII. Paris: 1860, . . 237

XI.—1. Ἡ παλαια και ἡ καινη Διαθηκη. Vetus et Novum Testamentum ex antiquissimo codice Vaticano. Edidit Angelus Maius, S. R. E. Card. Romæ. MDCCCLVII. 5 vols 4to.
2. Ἡ καινη Διαθηκη. Novum Testamentum ex vetustissimo codice Vaticano Secundis curis editum studio Angeli Maii, S.R.E. Card. Romæ. MDCCCLIX., . 256

XII.—1. Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform. By John Stuart Mill. Second Edition, with additions. London: 1859.
2. The practical Results of the Reform Act of 1832. By Sir John Walsh, Bart., M.P. London: 1859, . 266

CONTENTS OF No. 228.

Page

ART. I.—1. Transactions of the Royal Geographical Society for 1857, 1858, 1859.

2. Oriental and Western Siberia: A Narrative of Seven Years' Explorations and Adventures in Siberia, Mongolia, the Kirghis Steppes, Chinese Tartary, and Part of Central Asia. By Thomas William Atkinson. London: 1858.

3. Travels in the Regions of the Upper and Lower Amoor and the Russian Acquisitions on the Confines of India and China. By T. W. Atkinson. London: 1860.

4. The Lake Regions of Central Africa: A Picture of Exploration. By Richard F. Burton, Fellow and Gold Medallist of the R. G. Society. 2 vols. London: 1860.

5. Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours during an Eighteen Years' Residence in Eastern Africa. By the Rev. Dr. J. Lewis Krapf. With an Appendix by E. G. Ravenstein, F.R.G.S. London: 1860.

6. Travels and Scientific Explorations in Central Africa, during the years 1853 to 1857. By Dr. Edward Vogel, M.R.A.R.G.S.L, &c. &c. With a brief Memoir of his Life to his reputed Death by order of the Sultan of Wadai; and a Sketch of the Geography of Central Africa. By E. G. Ravenstein, M.R.G.S.

7. The Sources of the Nile: being a General Survey of the Basin of that River and of its Head Streams, with the History of Nilotic Discovery. By Charles T. Beke. London: 1860.

8. The Colony of Natal. By Robert James Mann, M.D., Superintendent of Education in Natal. London: 1860.

9. Seven Years' Residence in the Great Deserts of North America. By the Abbé Em. Domenech. 2 vols. London: 1860.

10. Narrative of an Expedition through the Southern Portion of Rupert's Land, from Lake Superior to near the foot of the Rocky Mountains, including the Region traversed by the Overland Route from

Page

Canada to British Columbia; with a Description of the Physical Geography, Geology, and Climate of the Country. By Henry Youle Hind, M.A., Professor of Chemistry and Geology in Trinity College, Toronto; in charge of the Canadian Assiniboine and Saskatchewan Exploring Expedition. With Maps of the Country explored, Geographical and Geological; and numerous Illustrations of Scenery, &c. London: 1860, ... 295

II.—Memoirs of the Insurrection in Scotland in 1715. By John, Master of Sinclair. From the Original Manuscript in the possession of the Earl of Rosslyn. With Notes by Sir Walter Scott, Bart. Printed at Edinburgh (for the Abbotsford Club): 1858, . 332

III.—A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature so far as it illustrates the Primitive Religion of the Brahmans. By Max Müller, M.A., Fellow of All Souls College and Taylorian Professor, Oxford. Second Edition, London: 1860, ... 361

IV.—1. Hugonis Grotii De Jure Belli et Pacis libri tres. Accompanied by an Abridged Translation. By William Whewell, D.D. 3 vols. Cambridge: 1859.
2. Commentaries upon International Law. By Robert Phillimore, Doctor of Laws. 3 vols. published. 8vo. London: 1859, ... 386

V.—1. Les Eglises de la Terre Sainte. Par le Comte Melchior de Vogüé. Paris: 1860.
2. An Essay on the Ancient Topography of Jerusalem. By James Fergusson, F.R.A.S. London: 1847.
3. The Holy City. By George Williams, B.D. Including an Architectural History of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. By Robert Willis, M.A. London: 1849.
4. Later Biblical Researches in Palestine. By Edward Robinson, D.D. London: 1856.
5. The Dictionary of the Bible. Edited by Dr. William Smith. Vol. I. London: 1860, . . 423

VI.—1. The Debates on The Grand Remonstrance, November and December, 1641. With an Introductory Essay on English Freedom under Plantagenet and Tudor Sovereigns. By John Forster, LL.D. London: 1860.
2. Arrest of the Five Members by Charles the First: A Chapter of English History rewritten. By John Forster. London: 1860.
3. Historical and Biographical Essays. By John Forster. 2 vols. London: 1858.

Page

4. Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion. By John Langton Sanford, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. London: 1858, . . . 460

VII.—1: The History, Ancient and Modern, of the Sheriffdoms of Fife and Kinross, with a Description of both, and of the Firths of Forth and Tay, and of the Islands in them, &c. By Sir Robert Sibbald, M.D. A new edition, with notes and illustrations. 1 vol. 8vo. Cupar, Fife: 1803.

2. History of the County of Fife, from the earliest period to the present time. By John M. Leighton, Esq. With engravings, &c. 3 vols. 4to. Glasgow: 1840.

3. History and Antiquities of Roxburghshire, and adjacent Districts; from the most remote period to the present time. By Alexander Jeffrey. 3 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh: 1839.

4. History of the County of Ayr, with a Genealogical Account of the Families of Ayrshire. By James Paterson. 2 vols. 8vo. Ayr, 1850: and Edinburgh, 1852.

5. History of Dumbartonshire, Civil, Ecclesiastical, and Territorial; with Genealogical Notices of the principal Families in the County. By Joseph Irving. 2nd edit. 1 vol. 4to. Dumbarton: 1860.

6. Buchan. By the Rev. John B. Pratt, M.A. 2nd edit. 1 vol. 8vo. Aberdeen: 1859, . . 489

VIII.—On Obscure Diseases of the Brain and Disorders of the Mind, their Incipient Symptoms, Pathology, Diagnosis, Treatment, and Prophylaxis. By Forbes Winslow, M.D., D.C.G., Oxon. London: 1860, . 526

IX.—1. Compendium of 'The Impending Crisis of the 'South.' By Hinton Rowan Helper, of North Carolina. New York: 1860.

2. Civilised America. By Thos. Colley Grattan. London: 1859.

3. Life of Stephen A. Douglas. By James W. Sheahan. London: 1860.

4. Speech of Hon. Charles Sumner, on the Bill for the Admission of Kansas as a Free State. In the United States Senate, June 4th, 1860.

5. Oration of Hon. Edward Everett, at Boston, on the 4th July, 1860, ... 545

THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW,

JULY, 1860.

No. CCXXVII

ART. I. — 1. *De la Baisse probable de l'Or: des conséquences commerciales et sociales qu'elle peut avoir, et des mesures qu'elle provoque.* Par MICHEL CHEVALIER. 8vo. Paris: 1859.

2. *On the probable Fall in the Value of Gold: the commercial and social consequences which may ensue, and the measures which it invites.* By MICHEL CHEVALIER, Member of the Institute of France, &c. Translated from the French, with Preface, by RICHARD COBDEN, Esq. Third Edition. London: 1859.

IT is now rather more than three centuries since the conquest of Mexico and Peru by the Spaniards and the discovery of rich mines of the precious metals in those regions excited the cupidity of Europe and opened a new epoch in human affairs. Of the numerous occurrences which conspired about that time to break the spell of old ideas, and to drive the world rapidly over the border line of mediævalism into the full movement of modern civilisation, this was certainly not the least powerful. The subsequent depreciation of gold and silver and the revolutions in private property, though the most conspicuous, were by no means the sole, nor even the most important, consequences of that event. The rage for gain,—the *auri sacra fames*, — awakened by the golden visions of the new Eldorado, hurried across the Atlantic those numerous and daring adventurers, who laid the foundation of the trans-Atlantic states. The vast sums of gold and silver liberated by their exertions supplied, and rendered possible, the remarkable expansion of Oriental trade which forms the most striking com-

mercial fact of the age that followed. Less directly, but still intimately, connected with the same event, were the sudden growth and temporary splendour of the Spanish monarchy, as well as its rapid decline; the establishment of the Poor Laws in England; the financial embarrassments of Charles I., which resulted in the Long Parliament and the Revolution; and the rise and progress of British maritime power.

Once more after the lapse of three centuries, the world has witnessed another great discovery of the precious metals. The auriferous sands and rocks of California and Australia are as much superior, in richness and abundance, to those which rewarded the industry of the Spanish adventurers, as these latter were superior to all which had been previously known; and gold has now for eight years been pouring into Europe in an exuberant tide of wealth beyond all former experience. What then will be the result of these Californian and Australian discoveries? and how far will they resemble in their scope and influence their prototypes of the sixteenth century? These are questions which, in the presence of such facts, cannot but force themselves upon every thoughtful mind.

But since the epoch of which we have spoken,—since the day when the sparkling veins on the sides of Potosi attracted the eye of the Indian shepherd,—a mighty change has come upon the world. Society in all its constituents has been profoundly modified. Commerce has grown to dimensions of which the merchants of the sixteenth century could have formed no conception. The entire foreign trade of the greatest commercial nation then in existence, probably did not much exceed that which is now carried on in a single English or American port. The total tonnage of the united galleons which constituted the Spanish mercantile marine, only amounted a century later, as we are informed by Robertson, to 27,500 tons,—little more than the tonnage of the Great Eastern steam-ship. Some of the most populous and wealthy communities of the present day had not yet begun to exist; and the whole quantity of the precious metals then in use was probably less than that which now circulates in some second-rate European kingdoms. The conditions under which the experiment of the sixteenth century was tried are no longer those with which we have to deal, and the precedents of that period may therefore be thought to have little application to the present time.

But, on the other hand, if we examine the details of this change, we shall find that the facts of which it consists are of a nature, in relation to the influence of the gold discoveries, in a great degree to counteract and neutralise each other; some

are we to attribute this anomalous circumstance? How are we to explain the fact that the gold currency of this kingdom has increased in a degree entirely out of proportion to the apparent requirements of its population, *without undergoing any corresponding depreciation in its value?* It appears to us that the explanation is to be found in the operation of a principle to which we adverted in the opening of this article, and to which we shall have occasion again to advert; the tendency of the increased production of gold to alter the distribution of wealth throughout society. This principle, operating through our trade with the gold countries, has for the last eight years been acting upon the pecuniary relations of different classes in this country; and the result has been a change in the distribution of our national wealth sensibly in favour of the industrial portion of the social body. We do not here enter into the grounds of this opinion, which would involve us in economic discussions of an inconvenient length. But, in illustration of the general tendency of the gold discoveries to favour the industrial classes, we may refer to the triple and quadruple wages now enjoyed by those amongst them who have emigrated to California and Australia, and to the remarkable advance which during the last eight years has taken place in the wages of almost every class of labourers at home*; an advance which has been accompanied by no corresponding movement in the incomes of other classes. A large increase has thus taken place in that portion of the general wealth which circulates among the industrial population; and this is just the portion in which the circulation of coin is most extensive. It is evident, therefore, (assuming as we do, this fact to represent a general tendency) that, under the influences engendered by the new discovery, the demand of the population for gold coin may augment much more rapidly than a mere regard to the increase of its numbers would lead us to suppose. As the production of gold continues, the proportion of the aggregate wealth of the world which goes to the industrial classes will increase; and, the field for credit contracting as we descend in the scale of society, the necessity for coin will increase also. In this way, it seems to us, a market may be opened for the new gold greatly more extensive than the considerations adduced by M. Chevalier would lead us to suppose; and a large amount of the new supplies may be thus disposed of, without involving the necessity of a fall, or at least of a corresponding fall, in their value. At the same time we are far

* See Dr. Strang's 'Papers on Wages,' published in the London Statistical Journal.

Acc. No. 7543 Date 23.7.75

from thinking that the demand thence arising will be sufficient to prevent the ultimate depreciation of the metal; though, as the example of this country proves, it may sensibly retard this result. At all events, the principle is one which should not be overlooked in an examination of the causes which may neutralise the direct tendencies of the gold movement.

So far as to the demand afforded to the gold supplies by the progress of trade and population. Let us now consider briefly another mode of disposing of the new gold, on which some writers have laid much stress; we mean the employment of it in the arts, in plate, and for decorative purposes. And here, as in the case we have just been considering, an examination of the facts shows upon what slight grounds they proceed who anticipate a large absorption of gold by this means. The desire for display, at least in that gross form of the propensity which finds satisfaction in the possession of gold plate or in the wearing of massive ornaments, is an attribute of semi-barbarous life, which, instead of increasing, declines with the advance of society.

'The display of gold in utensils more or less massive is the luxury of the less refined part of the community, whose eye is instinctively attracted by the glare of a dazzling metal, and whose desire is excited for an object to which there is vulgarly attached the idea of great riches. It is a species of magnificence which was reserved for the sovereigns of primitive nations: it constituted the splendour of the Incas, and that of Attila and of Genseric; it was the pride of the savage races whom the Europeans discovered in America.' (P. 98.)

The same passion for ornaments is a powerful instinct amongst the native races of Hindostan, with whom they serve at once as a mode of investment and a means of decoration. But, as civilisation makes progress, tastes of a different order are developed. Vanity perhaps loses nothing of its power, but it exhibits itself under a different guise, and is directed to different objects. Luxury, in its modes of display, as in other respects, undergoes refinement, and mankind seek enjoyment, less in the gratification of external sense, and more in the cultivation of the higher faculties. The superfluous expenditure of a nation advancing in civilisation is accordingly devoted less and less to objects which absorb mere masses of gold and silver, and more and more to purposes of a higher order — to the beautifying of its domains, the embellishing of its houses, the general cultivation of its tastes; and parks and mansions, paintings, sculpture and books, take the place of accumulations of plate, and collections of jewelry.

This tendency of civilisation to check the consumption of the

precious metals is very strikingly shown by some figures quoted by M. Chevalier. From returns given in Porter's 'Progress of the Nation,' it appears that the consumption of gold plate in England during the first half of the present century has not kept pace even with the progress of population. Notwithstanding the great increase which has taken place in the means of all classes during the interval, the average Englishman of the present day consumes less gold than the Englishman of fifty years back.

'From the first quinquennial period of the century to that which closed in 1850, the increase in the quantity of gold which paid duty was 50 per cent.; during the same time the increase of population was much greater; it doubled. Then if we take into account the quantity of gold required for this manufacture, we are amazed at its smallness. It is an atom in comparison with the total production. During the last quinquennial period of the half century, the annual average has only been 7,636 ounces.' (Pp. 92, 93.)

For the two years 1855 and 1856 the average consumption in this form was ten thousand ounces. For the same years the total production was nearly ten millions—that is to say nearly a thousand times greater! In France a similar state of things is exhibited. There also the consumption of the precious metals proceeds more slowly than the increase of population.

But it will be said, if the fashion of using gold in plate and ornaments is declining, other forms of this kind of expenditure have amazingly increased.

'Paris gilds itself not a little, and is surprisingly addicted to gold lace. Is there not in these two employments a consumption large enough to enable the producers of gold to dispose of their precious commodity, almost indefinitely, without any reduction in value? To reply to this question, let us calculate the quantity of metal which is required to gild a given surface. Gold, as is known, is the most malleable of metals; it is so to a degree of which it would be difficult, without ocular illustration, to form an idea. The goldbeater makes it into leaves which, thanks to the progress of his art, are now so thin that 14,000 form only the thickness of a *millimetre*, and, consequently, 14,000,000 of leaves laid one upon another would make a thickness of only a *metre* (about 39 inches). A cubic *metre* of solid gold, which would not weigh less than 680,440 ounces, would suffice to gild a surface of 3,450 acres, and 35,300 ounces would cover with gold 179 acres. It is a result which quite confounds the imagination. And yet the metal used in the manufacture of gold lace is spread over a much larger surface. The substance of the threads of which this lace is made consists of silver, the surface alone being gold, and one *gramme* of gold, worth 2*s.* 10*d.*, suffices to gild a thread 120 miles in length. In a piece of 20 fr. (16*s.*), there is gold enough to cover a thread which would extend from Calais to Marseilles. . .

. . . Let us now suppose that a room, suitably gilded, consumes five square *metres* (a *metre* is 39 inches) of gold leaf, which is, I believe, sufficient. At this rate 35,300 ounces would gild 144,000 saloons or apartments; that is to say, at least twenty times the number which are thus embellished in one year in all those cities where the houses are of a character to require their interiors to be gilded. With the remainder, what a multitude of picture-frames, books, kettle drums, cloths, epaulettes, and all kinds of objects might be clothed in a dazzling covering of gold! Let the number of gold leaves required for each apartment be multiplied, let the number of books and picture-frames be augmented, and still we shall arrive at no result which deserves a moment's consideration. At Paris, where nearly all the gold leaf is beaten which is consumed in France and a part of Europe, the quantity of gold operated upon does not exceed 40,650 to 42,400 ounces.' (Pp. 95–7.)

It would therefore seem that not much is to be expected from the extending use of gold in manufactures as a means of disposing of the new supplies. No doubt as depreciation sets in the fall in the value of the metal will, as in the case of other commodities, have some effect in inducing a larger consumption; but, with the facts before us which have just been cited, this can scarcely be expected to occur to an extent which would materially retard the fall.

And here we may mention an incident of the decline in the value of gold which is strangely at variance with popular anticipations, and will probably be cited as a proof that no depreciation has taken place. People generally imagine that as gold declines in value gold manufactures of all kinds will become cheaper. In one sense they will; they will be obtainable at a less outlay of labour; but they will not become cheaper in the sense in which the word is commonly understood — that is to say, they will not be obtainable *at a lower price*. On the contrary, in all countries where, as in this, gold is the standard metal, as its value declines *the price of gold manufactures will rise*. A little reflection will make this plain. Suppose the exchange-value of gold to fall, let us consider what will be the effect of this upon the price of a gold snuff-box. So far as the *material* of the article is concerned it is evident that the fall in the value of gold will have no effect, will be simply nugatory, since the same cause which will reduce the value of the material will reduce also the value of the coin (or notes convertible with coin) with which it is procured; the relation between money and raw gold will continue the same as before, and the price of the material of the box will, therefore, continue unaltered. But the material is only one element of the cost; there is, besides this, the labour ex-

pended in the making, and this also must be included in the price of the snuff-box. The effect, however, of a fall in the exchange value of gold will be to raise the money-price of labour in common with other things; whence it is plain that, with the progress of this fall, the price of the snuff-box, which must cover the cost of labour as well as that of raw material, must constantly rise. The effect may not be very perceptible in gold articles of much solidity; but in such manufactures as gold lace, in which the value of the workmanship greatly exceeds the value of the material, the rise in price will be nearly as remarkable as if gold did not enter into their composition.

Such are the two principal outlets which have been suggested as likely to create a market for the new gold; and, considerable as they at first sight appear, this examination of them has shown how entirely inadequate they must prove to sustain its value, supposing the production of the metal to continue at its present rate. The facts of the case thus distinctly point to a general depreciation of gold as the inevitable result of the causes now in action.

Against this conclusion, however, will be urged our experience of the movement up to the present time. Already, it will be said, for eight years the golden stream has been flowing: not less than 200,000,000*l.* sterling of metal have already been added to the common stock; and yet we look in vain for those signs of depreciation which, if there be any foundation for the apprehensions which have been expressed, should surely by this time have displayed themselves. No perceptible change, it is asserted, has yet taken place in the general level of prices, no disturbance has been experienced in our pecuniary relations. If then under the weight of this large augmentation the value of the metal has been sustained, there is clearly some fact or principle at work which has been overlooked in the reasonings on the subject; and if this fact or principle (whatever it may be) has been hitherto efficacious in preventing a fall, may we not expect that it will continue to be so? If no sensible effect has up to the present been produced, why, with only the same influences to contend against, need we be apprehensive for the future?

This argument is to be met by a two-fold answer: first, by a denial of the fact which is assumed, that no change has taken place in the value of gold; and, secondly, by pointing to a circumstance which has hitherto retarded its decline, but the influence of which must soon diminish.

With respect to the first point it should be observed that it must

always be a matter of considerable difficulty to ascertain whether, in point of fact, gold has during a given time fallen in value or not, unless the fall happens to be of a very marked and unequivocal kind. This must be so from the absence of any independent standard of value by which its variations can be measured, as well as from the variety of causes which, besides the value of money, affect the prices of commodities, and thus complicate the problem. There is, moreover, a principle in constant operation which, in a large class of cases, tends to conceal any fall which may occur in the value of the precious metals, — we mean the progress of the industrial arts. Every improvement in productive industry tends to promote cheapness and to lower price; and, as such improvements are constantly occurring, a fall in the value of gold will be as often shown in preventing a fall in the price of other things as in causing a rise. To ascertain, therefore, whether a change in the value of gold has really occurred must always be a difficult problem, requiring for its solution not only an extensive collection and accurate analysis of prices, but also a careful examination of the various causes affecting production on the one hand and consumption on the other: and it is a problem which, applied to the last ten years, presents, owing to the numerous causes of powerful disturbance which have been in action during that time, even more than the usual difficulty. We do not, therefore, propose to enter into this question here, but shall content ourselves with referring in a note* to some publications, in which it has been discussed with a fulness commensurate with its importance. By reference to these the reader will find that the facts of the case, far from being favourable to the assumption that the value of gold has been unaffected by the increased supply, lead rather to the conclusion that there are grounds for believing that a definitive depreciation of the metal has already taken place.

But, secondly, the above reasoning is to be answered by pointing to a circumstance which has undoubtedly acted up to the present time in counteraction of the causes tending to depress the value of gold, but the efficacy of which is diminishing, and may soon be entirely exhausted. This circumstance

* See tables of prices from 1851–57 ('History of Prices,' vol. vi. pp. 160–7.); also an article by M. Levasseur in the 'Journal des 'Economistes,' March, 1858; also tables published by Dr. Soetbeer of Hamburgh, giving returns of prices from 1831 to 1857; also an article in the 'Journal of the Dublin Statistical Society,' on 'the 'Depreciation of the Precious Metals,' January, 1859.

is the displacement of silver by gold in some currencies, and more particularly in that of France; a circumstance to which M. Chevalier very forcibly directs our attention, and which ranks unquestionably as of primary importance amongst the causes which have modified the gold movement up to the present time.

In the controversies which have taken place on this question, it has been almost uniformly assumed on the one side and conceded on the other, that, for the purpose of detecting variations in the value of gold, no better test can be selected than the price — that is the gold price — of silver*; and the price of silver not having risen more than three or four per cent. in the last ten years, it is argued that this ratio represents the utmost extent of the depreciation which can have taken place in gold. Indeed some writers have pressed this argument so far, as to maintain that gold has not fallen even to this extent; the rise in the price of silver, as they allege, being due rather to the increase in the demand for it than to the fall in the value of gold. But surely nothing can be more fallacious than the test of value which is thus set up. If anything unfits one commodity for measuring the value of another, it is the circumstance that they may both be applied to common purposes. No one would think of measuring the fluctuations in wheat by comparing it with oats, because both grains being employed for the same or similar purposes, any change in the value of one is sure to extend to the other. When, e.g., the wheat crop is in excess while the oat crop is an average one, it always happens that a portion of the consumption, which in ordinary years falls upon oats, is thrown upon wheat: the effect of which is at once to check the fall in the price of the more abundant grain, while, by diminishing the need for the other, it causes it to participate in the decline. The influence of the increased abundance of one commodity is thus distributed over both; the fall in price being less intense in degree in proportion as it is wider in extent. Now this is precisely what is happening in the relations of gold and silver. The crop of gold has been unusually large; the increase in the supply has caused a fall in its value; the fall in its value has led to its being substituted for silver; a mass of silver has thus been disengaged from

* Strange to say, even M. Chevalier makes this concession, although the facts which he adduces effectually expose the fallacy of it. 'The only good measure of the rise or fall occurring in the value of 'gold, is that which takes place in its price in silver money.' He adds, 'then it must be premised that no disturbance shall have arisen 'to cause a sudden change in the value of silver.' But such a disturbance is produced *ipso facto* by a change in the value of gold.

purposes which it was formerly employed to serve, and the result has been that both metals have fallen in value together; the depth of the fall being diminished as the surface over which it has taken place has been enlarged. The scene on which this interchange of gold and silver has hitherto been exhibited on the largest scale is the currency of France, in which, owing to the existence of a double standard,—or (if M. Chevalier prefers the phrase) a double legal tender,—one or the other metal is employed according as its worth in the markets of the world happens to vary in relation to its valuation at the French mint. Until a recent period, the metal which formed the staple of the French currency was silver, but, owing to the fall in the value of gold, consequent upon the discoveries, gold is now rapidly taking its place, and becoming the principal medium of circulation. Up to the year 1852 the importation of silver into France was always largely in excess of its exportation; but in that year the tide turned, and has since continued flowing outward with increasing volume. M. Chevalier states that by the end of 1857, France had parted with 45,000,000*l.* sterling of silver. On the other hand, during this time she had coined more than 100,000,000*l.* sterling of gold. The currency of France has thus, to borrow the curious but not inapt figure of our author played towards gold the part of a parachute to moderate its descent. But in proportion as gold has thus found a market, silver has been deprived of one; and the 45,000,000*l.* of silver liberated from the currency of France is as much an addition to the disposable supply in the world, and tends as effectually to lower its value, as if it had been raised immediately from the mines. The fall in the value of gold has thus, up to the present time, been at once checked and concealed,—checked by being substituted for silver, and concealed by being compared with it.*

* We are aware it has been maintained that the value of silver, so far from having fallen, has really risen during the last few years, in proof of which we are referred to the increased demand for it for Oriental remittance. That silver has risen in its *gold* price owing to this circumstance, we admit, but we deny that this is a proof of a rise in its *value*, any more than a rise in the gold price of any other commodity would prove a rise in its value at a time when the supply of gold was rapidly increasing. During the last two years the demand for silver for the East has been affected a good deal by requirements connected with the Indian mutiny; but if we investigate the causes of the extraordinary demand which has characterised the last four or five years, we shall find that they are in a principal degree traceable to the increased production of gold, operating through the expendi-

This interchange, however, of gold for silver in French circulation is not a process which can be carried on indefinitely, and M. Chevalier shows that it has already nearly reached its natural termination. When this has happened, the new gold will be deprived of that which has hitherto constituted its best market, the parachute which has moderated its descent will no longer be available, and what will be the consequence?

'From that moment,' says M. Chevalier, 'the fall in gold will be rapid. In a word, if, down to the present time, the immense production, of which Australia and California have been the theatre, has not produced a greater fall in gold, it is France which is the cause.' (P. 62.)

We are disposed to qualify in some degree our assent to this opinion. We think that, on the occurrence of the contingency in question — the exhaustion of silver from the French currency — the depreciation of gold will be more rapid, but we question if the acceleration of the decline will be as great as the words we have quoted seem to imply. M. Chevalier appears to assume that, when the process now going on in France is completed, all further substitution of one metal for the other will be at an end, and that the action of future supplies, concentrated on gold alone, will tell in the depreciation of this metal with proportionate effect. But we question the correctness of this assumption. We are inclined to think that the substitution of gold for silver in France is only a very striking example of a process which has been in unobserved operation over a much wider area, and which will continue after the French movement has ceased. In India, where there is an immense silver currency, the process has already begun, and signs are not wanting that it will soon assume more im-

ture of enlarged money incomes in England and the United States, on Oriental productions; and that thus the increased demand for silver, which is alleged as a proof that silver has risen in value, *is in reality a consequence of the large amount of gold available for its purchase.* Now if a disturbance in the relative values of the precious metals, arising from *this* cause, is to be taken as a proof, not that gold has fallen, but that silver has risen, in value, then it would be quite impossible ever to prove a depreciation of gold. The same argument might be applied to all other commodities; in each case it could be shown that the rise in price was the result of an increased demand for the article, and every advance in general prices would be attributed, not to the depreciation of money, but to the enhancement of commodities. In short, since money can only fall in value by being made the instrument of demand, the value of money could, according to this mode of reasoning, never fall.

portant dimensions. But the Indian Government, for the reasons set forth in Mr. Wilson's admirable Minute on the introduction of a gold currency, have wisely refused to establish a double standard in that country. It is of course the existence of the double standard which mainly leads to the substitution of one metal for the other, because the double standard is practically a permission for the debtor to pay his debts in whichever of the two metals may be cheapest at the time of payment. But although it is not probable that anything will arise to change the determination of the Government to preserve the single silver standard in India (assisted as we have previously remarked by a paper currency), yet considering the great suitability of gold for the purposes of ornamental manufacture, and of hoarding — purposes which prevail so extensively in India, and for which gold is much better adapted than silver — we cannot doubt but that, as, in the course of depreciation, the metal becomes obtainable on more favourable terms, it will gradually find its way, if not into the circulation, at least into the ornaments and hoards, and eventually displace silver to a considerable extent. These considerations do not apply to India alone: they are applicable more or less extensively to other countries where silver is the currency, and more particularly to China, where there is a large silver circulation, and where the habits of the people are in many respects similar to those of the people of Hindostan. For these reasons, we cannot concur in the assumption, that when the movement in the French currency is concluded, the future action of the new gold must be concentrated upon the gold currencies of the world. We think that its effect will still continue to be shared, though probably in a less degree than heretofore, by the other precious metal; and that consequently the fall in gold, though accelerated, will not proceed with that rapidity which M. Chevalier seems to anticipate.

But, although for these reasons we do not anticipate that rapid and sudden fall in the value of gold which M. Chevalier regards as the sure result of the exhaustion of silver from France (or more correctly of the repletion of the French currency with gold), we nevertheless fully admit, supposing the present production to continue, that the contingencies to which we have adverted can at the utmost delay,—they cannot prevent, this catastrophe. Regarding therefore, with him, an extensive depreciation of gold as probable, we shall conclude this article by adverting to some of the consequences which this result is likely to entail.

These consequences are at once so numerous and so compli-

cated, they will be felt in such large and in such minute transactions in life, that to develope them fully would require a volume instead of a few pages. As we have already intimated, there is a wide department of this question on which M. Chevalier does not enter at all—of the existence of which indeed he scarcely seems to be aware; but even within the range to which he has confined himself the questions which arise are both numerous and important.

One of the most important aspects of every social change is its effect on the working classes—those who live by the sweat of their brow, and who in every country form the bulk of the population. Let us then inquire what will be the effect of the gold discoveries on the interests of this large section of mankind? Will the event tend on the whole to improve or to deteriorate, to raise or to depress, their condition? The opinion of M. Chevalier is that, during the period while depreciation is in progress—a period which may extend over ten or twenty, or possibly over thirty or forty years—the effect will be prejudicial. As soon indeed as the movement shall have reached its lowest point, and gold shall have found its natural level, then he conceives the wages of the workman will rise in the same proportion as the price of his food, so that, while paying and receiving larger sums of money, he will be placed substantially in the same position as at present; but, pending the attainment of this result, the ordeal of depreciation will, as he thinks, be for the working classes a disastrous one.

'Experience shows that, when provisions rise, wages are not necessarily raised in the same proportion. Not that an upward movement of wages does not follow a continued dearness of provisions, but in the majority of employments it follows far behind. The working population are of all classes of society the most dependent, because they are the most necessitous. Being the least able to wait, owing to the pressure of want, they are the more apt to resign themselves to the terms offered them. Hence it is that the benefits which they expect to derive from a rise of wages are only yielded to them after many delays. It were easy to cite examples in proof of this assertion. It has been the subject of remark by Mr. Tooke in his important work on the "History of Prices." In his historical inquiry respecting the precious metals, Mr. Jacob has several remarks in the same sense, and among others he states his opinion that the institution of the Poor Law, which it is known dates from the reign of Elizabeth, was in England the effect of the changes caused by the fall in the precious metals.' (Pp. 117, 118.)

From this opinion of M. Chevalier (which is endorsed by Mr. Cobden, in his preface) we venture to dissent. We do not believe that the working classes, *as a body*,—whatever

may be the case in particular countries—will be injured by the depreciation of gold. We hold, on the contrary, that the general effect of the gold discoveries will be to alter the distribution of wealth in their favour, and on the whole to benefit them.

According to M. Chevalier, the industrial classes will suffer during the progress of the depreciation of gold, because the prices of the commodities they consume will constantly rise in advance of the rise in their wages. Now this we conceive to be, as a general proposition, essentially impossible. If the prices of the labourer's provisions and clothing rise, this result can only happen (assuming that the rise proceeds from an abundance of money) because more money is spent on those commodities; and, inasmuch as the labouring classes themselves immensely outnumber all classes who consume the same commodities, it is plain that it is *their* expenditure, and consequently *their* wages, which must substantially regulate the rise. The rise in wages, in short, is (where it proceeds from an abundance of money), the cause of the rise in the price of commodities, and consequently cannot be preceded by its own effect.

The circumstance which misled M. Chevalier appears from his reference to the remark of Mr. Tooke; for the case which Mr. Tooke had in view was the rise in the prices of corn and provisions which occurred during the last French wars—a rise due indeed in some slight degree to the depreciation then existing in the English currency—but, according to the opinion of Mr. Tooke, and we believe of all persons who have examined the facts of that time, due principally to the unusual number of deficient harvests which then occurred, aggravated as this circumstance was by the interruption of supplies from abroad during the war. The rise in prices at that time proceeded, in short, from a dearth of commodities, not from an abundance of money; and the rise in wages which followed, as a matter of necessity, fell short of the advance in provisions, since it was only thus that consumption could be kept within the limits of supply. It is by confounding the effects of these two very different cases that M. Chevalier has fallen into the error of supposing that the labouring classes, as a body, must suffer from the depreciation of gold.

But the view, thus suggested, has probably been confirmed by another circumstance. It would seem, as a matter of fact, that prices *in France* have up to the present time advanced more rapidly than wages.* This, however, is not a necessary or ge-

* See the articles by M. Levasseur, published in the 'Journal des Economistes,' February and March, 1858.

neral consequence of the depreciation of gold, but, like the case of England in the sixteenth century to which Jacob refers, is to be attributed to that other operation of the gold movement, of which we have more than once spoken — the change it is causing in the distribution of national wealth. In the sixteenth century this disturbance was in favour of the Spanish, the Portuguese, and the Dutch; while the English, further removed from the spring head of the new metal, received their supplies more slowly and in scantier streams. Money incomes in England therefore rose less rapidly than prices in common markets, and the population of England suffered accordingly. We have no doubt that this was a leading cause of the industrial distress which prevailed throughout a portion of the reign of Queen Elizabeth *, and which led to the introduction of the Poor Law. In the present gold movement, however, the tables have been turned, and the monetary disturbance is now in favour of the Anglo-Saxon. It is now England and the United States that have their hands in the till, and the money which they extract is employed in raising prices against the nations who in the sixteenth century were gainers at their expense. It is to this cause — the disturbance created by the gold discoveries in the distribution of purchasing power in the world — that the movement of prices in France in advance of incomes (so far as this is a fact) is to be attributed, and not to any tendency in prices during a depreciation of money to rise more rapidly than the incomes by the expenditure of which alone they can be raised.

And here we may remark, as bearing on the purpose which M. Chevalier had in view in this discussion — the change of the monetary standard in France from gold to silver — that the consideration here urged goes directly to the root of his argument. If the sufferings of the French workmen during the period of transition be the result of a depreciation of the standard, then of course the disaster may be avoided by sub-

* See on this point a curious work, entitled 'A Briefe Conceipte 'touching the Common Weale of this Realme of England,' published in 1581, and attributed to William Stafford. Of this work Anderson, in his 'Annals,' conjectures that it was written by direction of the queen's ministers, 'since scarcely any ordinary person in those 'early days could be furnished with so copious a fund of excellent 'matter.' Mr. Froude, in the highly interesting and important volume of his history which treats of the reign of King Edward VI., has thrown great light on the state of the currency at that period, and its effect on the condition of the people.

stituting for gold, as our author recommends, a metal such as silver, of which the value is steady; but if, as we contend, the evil in question be the result of the increased purchasing power of other nations, it is plain that the proposed remedy must be futile. No change in the Mint regulations of France will prevent the nations which are in possession of the new gold from appropriating an increased proportion of the aggregate wealth of the world. To effect this it would be necessary not merely to deprive gold of its character as a standard, but to annihilate its purchasing power altogether, to dethrone it from its position, as the universal equivalent of commerce.

As we have already intimated, we conceive that the gold movement, whatever may be its effects in particular cases, will, on the whole, operate favourably for the industrial classes of society, by throwing into their hands an increased share of the purchasing power of the world. It is this which we regard as the great redeeming incident of the gold discoveries. In almost every other aspect in which we contemplate the occurrence, it is fraught with inconvenience, hardship, and injustice, introducing uncertainty into mercantile dealings, disturbing contracts which were designed to be fixed, stimulating the spirit of commercial speculation, already too strong, and bringing unmerited loss upon classes who have the strongest claims on our sympathy and whom upon social grounds it is most desirable to sustain.

If we inquire who the people are who will suffer by the impending monetary changes, the answer is, in the first place and principally, those whose incomes consist in fixed sums of money, or whose property depends on fixed contracts expressed in the current gold coin of the realm. Adopting the assumption of M. Chevalier (which with him we make for the sake of distinctness, and not as expressing a matured opinion) that the fall in the value of gold will be 50 per cent., then the loss to the holders of all such incomes will be to the extent of one half of their means. They will receive the same nominal amount as at present, the same number of bank notes, which will be exchangeable for the same number of sovereigns of the same weight and fineness; but these bank notes or sovereigns will only procure one half as much as they do now of the necessaries, comforts, and luxuries of life.* This

* This is not strictly true, since the progress of invention in the productive arts tends constantly to diminish the cost, and therefore the value, of commodities; and so far as this takes place, the fall in the value of money will be neutralised. But though the possessors of fixed incomes will not on this account be losers to the full extent

is surely a serious matter, and its gravity is not diminished when we consider who the persons are who by the course of events (always supposing the production of gold to continue) will be placed in this position. They are, in the first place, fundholders and mortgagees, a class who, whatever may be the popular idea upon the subject, really deserve as much consideration and sympathy as any other in the community. For of what is a large portion of funded property and of property lent on mortgage composed? It is composed, to a very large extent, of trust money, and constitutes, as such, the provision made for widows and orphans, for younger children and minors, and others who, from their age, sex, or circumstances, are incapacitated for taking part in the active pursuits of life. The persons thus provided for are also very frequently persons whose social rank is rather in advance of their pecuniary means of supporting it, with whom, therefore, a reduction of income will frequently necessitate, not merely a curtailment of physical enjoyment, but a descent in the social scale, a loss of caste and position, with the many distressing mortifications which such a loss involves. Again, trust money includes the property of endowed bodies, of charitable and benevolent institutions, schools, hospitals, and churches, all which, with the fall in the value of gold, will be deprived of a corresponding proportion of their income, and thus have abridged their means of public usefulness. So likewise the calculations on which the whole system of life assurance is based in this country, affecting the interests of thousands of families and millions of money, would be entirely upset, if the payment of policies on deaths came to be made in coin depreciated below the value of that in which the annual premiums have been paid. Instead of representing, as is commonly imagined, secure affluence, and pensioned idleness — interests which may well bear some additional pressure — the interests at stake in funded or mortgage property or in life assurance, are among the most helpless as well as the most important which society comprises. It would be nearer the truth to say that they represent the classes on whom a pecuniary loss will inflict the maximum of harm.

of the fall in the value of money, comparing their condition under the new monetary *régime* with their condition at present, they *will* be losers to this extent if we make the comparison, as we ought to do, *not* with their condition at present, but with their condition *as it would have been but for the depreciation.* They will be prevented by the fall in the value of money from participating on equal terms with other classes in the advantages of advancing civilisation.

But the loss from the depreciation of money will not be confined to the recipients of fixed money incomes. Those also will be sufferers by the change, though in a less degree and for a temporary period, whose remuneration is determined more by custom than by competition; and this description includes a much larger number of persons than is commonly supposed. It includes, e. g. two of the three learned professions, the medical and the legal, and a not unimportant portion of the third. It includes also the large number of officials, whether civil or military, whether in public or private employment, who are hired on yearly salaries. With respect to this large class, although their remuneration will probably in the end be brought into harmony with the altered state of pecuniary affairs, yet during the period of transition, the adjustment will always be in arrear of events; and those who are comprised in it will suffer accordingly. The rise in prices will be very palpable before a doctor's or barrister's fee will be increased, or a curate's salary raised.

On the other hand, it must be remembered (and although M. Chevalier has not overlooked this side of the question, he has scarcely, we think, given it its due weight) that for every loss of this kind, there is, from the nature of the case, a corresponding gain. If the national creditor be mulcted to the extent of one half of his property, the tax-payer pockets an equal sum; if the mortgagee loses, the mortgagor gains; if the professional classes are curtailed in their earnings, the public who employ them obtain their services so much the more cheaply. There is thus in all cases a set-off; and, this being so, it might seem as if, whatever were the case with individuals, with the community as a whole there would be neither loss nor gain, neither benefit nor injury. But this, we believe, would be a most erroneous conclusion; for, putting aside entirely the substantial injustice involved in the discharge of obligations in a sense different from that in which they were incurred; putting aside all the dangers of a change, affecting deeply an extensive mass of interests, and opening to society an ordeal, which M. Chevalier thinks sufficiently formidable to deserve the epithet 'revolutionary;' putting these considerations aside, and considering solely the effect of the pecuniary transfer, the question still remains, whether the changes of condition thus produced are, on the whole, salutary or the reverse; whether they conduce to the gain or loss,—social and moral as well as purely economical—of the nation in which they occur. We have already stated our opinion that the effect of the gold discoveries will be to improve the physical status of the great body of the

people; and so far to promote the advancement of civilisation and human happiness. But, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that the sudden introduction of higher rates of wages and more ample means amongst the working classes often tends to their own destruction. The temptation of money inflames the worst passions of their nature for drunkenness and debauchery in men, for dress and frivolity in women. It militates against those homely virtues of thrift and self-restraint, which most effectually elevate the condition of mankind as intelligent and moral beings. Experience proves that it is not amongst those who have the most money at their disposal that the best examples of manly independence are to be found. The highly paid pitmen and navvies of this country are the most brutal portion of the community; the gold of the Australian diggers is too often frittered away in reckless sensual indulgence; and although the wages of labour are far higher in the United States than they are in Europe, we question whether the moral standard of the population can sustain an equally favourable comparison. It may therefore be doubted whether the physical improvement resulting from the greater diffusion of gold will be sufficient to outweigh the concomitant evils, and we are far from regarding these evils as either few or trifling. It affords slight matter for congratulation that a large number of respectable people in narrow circumstances, many of them old and helpless, should be deprived of one half of their livelihood in order that tax-payers may be discharged from a portion of their fair liabilities; or that the recipients of charitable endowments, widows and orphans, the sick and infirm, the needy in mind and in body, should be stinted in their supplies for the purpose of relieving landlords of their encumbrances; and as little do we think it a matter for rejoicing that the mercantile and manufacturing classes should be aggrandised at the expense of physicians, barristers, clergymen, and soldiers. It may be said, indeed, that such a transfer of property tends to strengthen the motives to enterprise and accumulation, and thus to promote the growth of national wealth. But, before conceding much weight to this argument, we may ask if the strengthening of such motives be at present such a social desideratum, either in Great Britain or in the United States (the countries which will reap the largest profit from the movement), as to be worth procuring at such a cost.

It seems to us that the instincts of commercial enterprise are already sufficiently strong in the Anglo-Saxon race, and that it is not so much more wealth which we want, as a higher sense of the responsibilities of wealth, and that more judicious

expenditure of it which would accompany more just perceptions. If this be so, we may well doubt if the pecuniary disturbances with which we are threatened, are likely to prove as purely beneficial as those whose faith in progress is more implicit than our own are accustomed to describe them. The mode in which wealth is distributed is always of more importance than its aggregate amount; and a process which increases the aggregate amount of wealth only by operating on its distribution, is therefore, at best, a questionable specific. We have seen what the nature of the impending changes is. They will in many instances increase, instead of mitigating, existing inequalities of condition. They will enrich the cosmopolitan merchant, at the expense of the petty trader. They will enrich the commercial classes, as a whole, at the expense of possessors of fixed incomes, of the professional classes, and of salaried *employés*. Landlords will probably, on the whole, be gainers; they will lose temporarily where the outstanding leases are long, but they will gain permanently through the lightening of their fixed encumbrances; the balance of gain being obtained by encroaching on the incomes of their mortgagees. The tendency of the movement, as amongst the middle and higher portions of society, will thus be to aggrandise the wealthy at the expense of the indigent; to tax the more liberal and enlightened, for the benefit of the more narrow-minded and selfish; to enrich those whose command of wealth is, perhaps, already somewhat in advance of their sense of its responsibilities, from the means of classes at once more necessitous and more cultivated. These are the evils of the change, and against these we have to set the benefit to the working classes, and the ultimate gain to the world from the opening of new and fertile regions to man's industry, and the extension of his dominion over the earth.

It is impossible to assign any limits to the effects which must gradually ensue from a progressive change in the value of the commodity that has become by usage and by law the fixed basis of all contracts — a change, we venture to say, scarcely less momentous to the conditions of our social economy, than an alteration in the material conditions of this planet would be to the physical existence of man. But there is one consideration, of a political nature, which strikes us as so curious and important, that we must devote a few lines to it before we conclude. The political franchise of the electors of the United Kingdom is mainly based upon the payment of rent. Be it more or be it less, the occupation of a dwelling of a certain value determined by the law, is the common test of electoral capacity. We will assume, for the sake of argument, that the ten-pound householder is still the main ingredient in the electoral

body; but if the steady influx of gold produces the consequences anticipated by M. Chevalier and Mr. Cobden, one of the first results will be an increase in the nominal value of houses, and, everything rising in similar proportions, the present five-pound householder will be gradually brought within the limits of the ten-pound franchise, though the rise of wages and of prices moving *pari passu* may in other respects have left his condition unaltered. Hence the effect of the gold discoveries and of the fall in the value of gold will be greatly to extend the political franchise, though it should remain nominally at the same figure; and if the extraordinary supplies of the precious metals, which have poured into Europe in the last nine or ten years, should continue, they will, by the operation of natural causes, gradually but irresistibly extend the basis of popular power.

That good will on the whole predominate, we believe; but let us not, on this account, close our eyes to the serious cost at which this preponderance of good will be obtained. As regards this country, it appears to us that the best means of lessening the evils of the crisis, is by giving timely warning of its approach. Much may be done in the framing of settlements, in the granting of leases, and in the selection of investments, to mitigate its severity; the grand rule being, to avoid as much as possible purely monetary securities. The foresight of Lord Burleigh, warned by the changes which he saw around him, effected in the sixteenth century the partial substitution of corn for money rents, and in this way the incomes of colleges and other institutions have been preserved, which but for this precaution would have long since dwindled into insignificance. The plan adopted under the Tithe Commutation Act, for regulating rent-charge by the price of agricultural produce, suggests another means by which the crisis may be moderated. A permissive law facilitating arrangements of this kind would be free from all objection on the score of justice, and might be attended with much public advantage. But what is of far more importance than any specific plan is that the public should be made aware of the principles which are in operation, and of their inevitable tendency. When the tendency of the gold movement is fully recognised, means will not be wanting for anticipating, and, as the phrase is, 'discounting' its effects; and, in proportion as this is done, —in proportion as its influence is distributed over a wider area of interests and over a longer period of time,—will the inequalities with which it is fraught be corrected, and its inevitable hardships alleviated.

ART. II. — *The Diaries and Correspondence of the Right Hon. George Rose, containing original Letters of the most Distinguished Statesmen of his day.* Edited by the Rev. LEVESON VERNON HARCOURT. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1860.

THIS publication consists of a selection from the papers of the Right Honble. George Rose, which has been given to the world by the authority of his grandsons. The most valuable part of them is a diary, kept by Mr. Rose, during a considerable portion of his official life; the rest consists of letters, principally addressed to Mr. Rose himself, by various persons, and on subjects of a public or official nature. The editor, Mr. Leveson Vernon Harcourt, a son of the Archbishop of York, has arranged these in a chronological order, and instead of subjoining to them such illustrations, in the way of notes, as might serve to assist the reader's memory with respect to the obscurer persons and facts mentioned in them, he has intercalated long dissertations of his own, chiefly controversial, in answer to Lord John Russell's 'Life of Fox,' Lord Holland's 'Memoirs,' and other modern works, which have no other reference to Mr. Rose, than that they relate to facts recorded in his papers. In order to make room for these partisan diatribes, he suppresses certain portions of Mr. Rose's diaries, on the ground that they are wanting in interest. We shall not think it a part of our duty to comment on the editor's contribution to these volumes; but we are bound to say, that we should prefer the driest part of Mr. Rose's diary to the most vivacious and brilliant passages of the editor's original effusions; and we trust that if this work should reach a second edition, the editor may make room for some of the suppressed portions of Mr. Rose's manuscripts, by omitting an equal portion of his own commentaries.

George Rose, born in 1744, was descended from a Scotch family. No particulars are given respecting his parents, beyond the statement that he was the second son of his father by a second wife. When he was little more than four years old, he was adopted by a maternal uncle, who resided at Hampstead, and was educated by him. After a short stay at Westminster School, he was sent by his uncle to sea, but quitted the Naval service in 1762 at the age of eighteen. On returning to England

he found that his uncle had died suddenly, without leaving any will, so that he was disappointed of the legacy which he expected from that quarter. He was now appointed a clerk in the Record Office, and in 1767 was employed by the House of Lords to superintend the printing of their journals. He afterwards became keeper of the Records; and in 1777, at the age of thirty-three, he was appointed Secretary of the Tax Office. In the latter part of Lord North's Ministry, he was frequently consulted by the Government respecting the business of his department, and in the short Rockingham Administration, in 1782, Lord George Cavendish, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, obtained his advice on general financial measures. Lord Shelburne, the successor of Lord Rockingham, offered Mr. Rose the office of Secretary to the Treasury, Mr. Pitt being the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Mr. Rose, who was then thirty-eight years old, and was married, accepted this political office with considerable hesitation, and upon the condition that, while holding it, he should not sit in Parliament. To this resolution he adhered; and he refused to accept the seat of Newport, which at the request of Lord Shelburne was vacated for him by Sir Richard Worsley. This arrangement was desired by the Government, because Mr. Orde,* the other Secretary to the Treasury, had been unable to obtain a seat. While he held this situation, the reversion of the Office of Clerk of the Parliaments was granted to Mr. Strutt and himself, after the death of Mr. Ashley Cowper, the actual holder, then more than eighty years of age. While Mr. Rose was Secretary to the Treasury, under Lord Shelburne, he procured the abolition of the system by which the secretaries and clerks of this department were paid separately by fees upon instruments issuing from or passing through the office. The change which he effected was, to carry these fees to a common fund, out of which the members of the office received fixed salaries. The salary of the secretaries was then fixed at 3000*l*, a year, which was subsequently increased by Mr. Pitt to 4000*l*.* It has since been reduced to 2000*l*.

On the fall of Lord Shelburne's Administration, after a duration of nine months, at the beginning of 1783, and on the accession of the Coalition Government, Mr. Rose received an offer to retain his office, which he declined. He parted with Lord Shelburne on bad terms, chiefly in consequence of a disappointment about a colonial collectorship, which he wished to obtain for his wife's brother. In the summer of 1783*, he

* The date is erroneously printed 'July, 1782,' in vol. i. p. 31.

made a tour on the Continent with Lord Thurlow, then, as well as himself, out of office. On his return from Geneva to Paris, he met Mr. Pitt, by the appointment of the latter. His intercourse with that Minister, while they were both at the Treasury, had not been intimate; but Mr. Pitt, who already at the age of twenty-four, doubtless anticipated with confidence the important public position which he was about to occupy, seems to have perceived in Mr. Rose the unambitious, trustworthy, and businesslike qualities, which would make him a useful follower. He accordingly entered at once into confidential conversation with the Ex-Secretary of the Treasury; declared his alienation from Lord Shelburne; and expressed an earnest desire for a permanent and close intimacy with him. Mr. Rose, who seems at this time not to have contemplated a political career, reminded Mr. Pitt that he could be of little use to him in politics out of Parliament; but on Mr. Pitt's renewing the expression of his wishes, Mr. Rose consented, and became from this moment unalterably attached to his fortunes. Mr. Rose was Pitt's senior by fifteen years.

He mentions that when he was at Paris, he went to Versailles, to see the King pass in state to the chapel, and that the discussion among the great officers of state was almost as free as he had heard in the House of Commons. Such were unquestionably the fashionable sentiments among the French aristocracy, until their real danger arrived, when they showed, for the most part, an utter incapacity to guide and control the spirit which they had helped to evoke.

Mr. Rose's fidelity to his leader was not destined to be tried by any long period of political adversity. He refused, indeed, at this time, to support Mr. Pitt's motion for Parliamentary Reform, or to vote with him in favour of the abolition of the slave trade; but on the dismissal of the Coalition Ministry at the end of 1783, and upon Mr. Pitt's apparently inauspicious entry upon his long administration, Mr. Rose was reappointed to the office of Secretary to the Treasury, which he held for the next eighteen years.

The following short letter from Lord Percy to Mr. Rose is worthy of being extracted, as adding another to the numerous confident predictions of the failure of men, who have proved eminently successful, but were not endowed with brilliant and showy qualities. It is dated October, 1782.

'By the by, I see the papers announce an intention of sending Lord Cornwallis out to command in chief in India. I believe I have often told you my opinion of his lordship. He is a worthy, honest,

brave man; 'but more than all that is necessary to make a good general. I know him well; and I thought, since his last business in America, everybody else had known him also. One thing I will venture to foretell (and I beg you will remember it), that if this step is determined upon he will lose his reputation, and we our territories in that part of the world. He is as fit to command in chief as I am to be Prime Minister.'

The accounts of the transactions growing out of the King's madness in 1788, found in Mr. Rose's papers, deserve to be consulted by the historian of the period, but there is nothing which requires particular mention by us.

The following letter from Mr. Pitt to Lord Stafford is dated November 13. 1792; it was therefore written after the French aggression upon Holland, and a few months before the execution of Louis XVI., and the declaration of war by the Convention against England. It shows that at this time the English Government were not co-operating with Austria and Prussia against France, and that Mr. Pitt contemplated a speedy termination of the war, and a total abstinence from intervention with the internal government of France. These views were afterwards developed in the despatch of Lord Grenville to the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg, dated 29th December, 1792.*

'The strange and unfortunate events which have followed one another so rapidly on the Continent are in many views matter of serious and anxious consideration.

'That which presses the most relates to the situation of Holland, as your Lordship will find from the enclosed despatch from Lord Auckland†, and as must indeed be the case in consequence of the events in Flanders. However unfortunate it would be to find this country in any shape committed, it seems absolutely impossible to hesitate as to supporting our ally in case of necessity, and the explicit declaration of our sentiments is the most likely way to prevent the case occurring. We have therefore thought it best to send without delay instructions to Lord Auckland to present a memorial to the States, of which I enclose a copy. I likewise enclose a copy of instructions to Sir Morton Eden at Berlin, and those to Vienna are nearly to the same effect. These are necessarily in very general terms, as, in the ignorance of the designs of Austria and Prussia, and in the uncertainty as to what events every day may produce, it seems impossible to decide definitively at present on the line which we ought to pursue, except as far as relates to Holland.

* Cited in Mr. Erskine's speech, Parl. Hist. vol. xxxiv. p. 1313.

† Lord Auckland was at this time British Minister at the Hague.

'Perhaps some opening may arise which may enable us to contribute to the termination of the war between the different Powers in Europe, leaving France (which I believe is the best way) to arrange its own internal affairs as it can. The whole situation, however, becomes so delicate and critical that I have thought it right to request the presence of all the members of the Cabinet who can without too much inconvenience give their attendance. It will certainly be a great satisfaction if your Lordship should be of that number.' *

Mr. Rose's Diary contains a copious and authentic narrative of the events which produced, accompanied, and followed the resignation of Mr. Pitt in February 1801. As we have, in a recent number, collected the accounts of this transaction from several recent publications of private papers †, we shall, on this occasion, limit ourselves to those passages of Mr. Rose's Diary which contain some new information, or which decide points previously doubtful.

Mr. Pitt's first letter to the King proposing Catholic Emancipation was dated on Sunday, the 1st of February. Mr. Addington (then Speaker) had an interview with the King at the Queen's House, on the previous Friday, which lasted four hours. From this, and a variety of other circumstances, Mr. Rose is satisfied that 'there was from the beginning an cager-'ness in Mr. Addington to catch at the situation, without re-'gard to his friend, or recollecting that he owed his political 'existence to him.'

On February 5th Mr. Pitt had assured Mr. Rose that the formation of a new Ministry was undertaken by Addington, with his concurrence and upon his advice, and he therefore anxiously desired his private and personal friends to remain in office. On a subsequent occasion, Mr. Pitt informed Mr. Rose that he had pressed both Lord Hawkesbury and Lord Castlereagh to join the Addington Ministry. (Vol. i. p. 493.)

The hostile part taken by Lord Auckland with respect to the Catholic question, clearly appears from these papers. Mr. Pitt answered an explanatory letter from him with a cutting reproach, and at the end of March, in consequence of a reflection cast by Lord Auckland upon Mr. Pitt in the House of Lords, Mr. Rose, as Mr. Pitt's friend, broke off all private intercourse with him.

* Among Mr. Rose's papers is a series of notes, apparently designed as heads of a speech, for the purpose of showing that Mr. Pitt wished to avoid war with France until it was forced upon him by the progress of events. (Vol. i. p. 132.)

† Ed. Rev. vol. ciii. p. 349.

Mr. Rose reports a curious conversation with Lord Loughborough, in which the latter described the recent proceedings in the Cabinet with respect to the Catholic question. The account which the late Chancellor gave is as follows. In October 1800, Lord Westmoreland, then Privy Seal, showed the King a letter from Lord Clare, telling him that the question was about to be agitated; by which intelligence the King was much disturbed: at the same time a paper drawn by Lord Castlereagh, recommending a State provision for the Catholic clergy, admission of the Catholics to Parliament and office, and an arrangement about tithes *, was circulated among the members of the Cabinet. The Prince of Wales had conveyed to Mr. Pitt very distinctly his opinion in favour of the measure. Discussions on the subject took place in the Cabinet from time to time between the autumn and the meeting of Parliament, during which it appeared that the Cabinet was thus divided:—

For the Question.	*Against it.*
Mr. Pitt,	The Chancellor (Lord Loughborough),
Lord Grenville, strongly,	Duke of Portland,
Mr. Dundas, strongly,	Lord Westmoreland,
Mr. Windham, strongly,	Lord Liverpool, absent, but vehement by letter,
Lord Spencer, very moderately,	Lord Chatham, absent but understood to be against.†
Lord Camden, in no office, but decided.	

No final decision had however been taken; when at a levee on Wednesday, January 28th, 1801, the King said to Mr. Dundas, in a tone loud enough to be heard by those who were standing near him, that he understood the question to be in agitation among the Ministers; that nothing could be more disagreeable or painful to him; and that he should consider the person who supported it as his worst enemy. A cabinet was in consequence held on the following day, at which Mr. Pitt undertook to prepare a test to be taken by the Catholics. On Friday (the day on which Mr. Addington had a long interview

* This paper is printed in the Castlereagh Correspondence, vol. iv. p. 392., but is erroneously referred by the editor to the year 1801.

† It will be observed that, with the exception of Lord Loughborough, the whole intellectual strength of the Cabinet was in favour of the Catholic question. Lord Liverpool is Charles, first earl, who was a favourite of George III.; he died in 1808. His son Lord Hawkesbury became Foreign Secretary in the Addington administration, and was subsequently Prime Minister.

with the King), Mr. Pitt sent a draught of the proposed test to Lord Loughborough; and on Saturday he wrote his ultimatum to the King, which was dated and despatched on the following day. This letter was not founded on any minute or formal decision of the Cabinet; nor was it communicated to the Chancellor or any other of the dissentient minority. The first knowledge of the decisive step taken by Mr. Pitt which the Chancellor obtained was derived from Mr. Dundas at the following levee on Wednesday, February 4. The Chancellor was 'thunderstruck' at hearing that the Government was virtually dissolved, and he thought that Mr. Pitt's conduct was the more extraordinary, because nothing had passed at the Cabinet on the previous Thursday which could lead to the supposition that the question was likely to be brought to a sudden or premature determination. At an audience after the levee on Wednesday the 11th, the King spoke to Lord Loughborough in high terms of Mr. Pitt, and asked if he could rely on Mr. Pitt's support of the new administration; he at the same time observed that previous Ministers had pursued a different conduct, and he referred particularly to Lord North, whose junction with Mr. Fox he attributed to the gaming debt of George North. Lord Loughborough gave the King a guarded answer: he pointed out that Mr. Pitt might be alienated from the Government by differences of opinion and by the pressure of friends. He likewise assured the King that the story as to the price paid by Fox for Lord North's coalition being the condonation of his son George North's gaming debt, was untrue, though currently reported at the time.

Lord Loughborough, destitute of real political convictions, had played the game of encouraging the King's prejudices against the opinions of the Prime Minister, without reckoning on the contingency that he might himself be involved in the general wreck. When, therefore, he became aware of his own fate, he wished to restore Mr. Pitt to office, and on March 12. sent Mr. Rose with a message to Mr. Pitt on the subject; but the change was then irrevocable.

On February 18. Mr. Rose was with Mr. Pitt for three hours. The great Minister appeared more affected than at any time since his resignation. His eyes were filled with tears during the chief part of the conversation.

'The most remarkable thing that fell from him was a suggestion that on revolving in his mind all that had passed, it did not occur to him that he could have acted in any respect otherwise than he had done, or that he had anything to blame himself for, except not having earlier endeavoured to reconcile the King to the measure

about the Catholics, or to prevail with his Majesty not to take an active part on the subject.' (Vol. i. p. 308.)

It may be observed, that Lord Malmesbury, in his Diary (Feb. 6. 1801), censures Mr. Pitt for his want of providence in not preparing the King's mind gradually for this measure. If, he says, Pitt had been less careless, and had reckoned less on his own power, no difficulty could have arisen. Mr. Fox likewise attacked him in the House of Commons (March 25th, 1801), for not having ascertained the King's opinion long before the introduction of his intended measure.

The ministerial changes had not been completed, and Mr. Pitt was still formally First Lord of the Treasury, when the King's madness, which had been dormant since 1789, re-appeared. It had been revived by the agitation of mind consequent on Mr. Pitt's resignation. It began about February 21., and lasted till the 11th or 12th of March. During this interval, Mr. Pitt had interviews with the Prince of Wales, respecting the arrangements for a Regency. Symptoms of unsoundness recurred during the spring and summer, and the King was at one time again under restraint. On the 21st of April, the Prince of Wales sent for the Chancellor, Lord Eldon, and informed him that it was the intention of His Majesty, declared on the previous day, to devolve the government on him, the Prince; that he therefore wished the Chancellor to consider the proper mode of carrying that purpose into effect; and that it was the King's intention to retire to Hanover or to America. The Prince added that the Queen and his brothers wished him to take measures for confining the King, and that he himself desired that the Willises should be removed from the King's person. The Chancellor said very little, and nothing seems to have resulted from this strange communication: though a similar communication was made by the Prince a few days afterwards to Lord Rosslyn (Lord Loughborough).

It was in consequence of the effect produced on the King's mind by the agitation of the Catholic question, that Mr. Pitt was induced at this time to give an assurance that he would not revive the subject during his reign. 'Recollect' (says Bishop Tomline, in a letter to Mr. Rose of August 14. 1801) 'that 'when the King was recovered from his illness, Mr. Pitt saw 'Dr. John Willis at Mr. Addington's; and before Mr. Adding-'ton authorised Dr. Willis to tell His Majesty that during his 'reign he would never agitate the Catholic question; that is 'whether in office or out of office.' In a subsequent letter to Mr. Rose, of December 23. 1801, the Bishop, in describing

a recent conversation with Mr. Pitt, of which the early part related to his conduct towards Mr. Addington, proceeds thus:—

'Upon the Catholic question our conversation was less satisfactory. He certainly looks forward to the time when he may carry that point, and I fear he does not wish to take office again unless he could be permitted to bring it forward and to be properly supported. I endeavoured to convince him that he had been deceived by those on whom he relied on this question, as far as Ireland itself was concerned, and that the measure would be very unpopular in England. I did not seem to make much impression upon this point, but I had not time to say all I wished and could have said.'

On his leaving office in 1801, Mr. Pitt's debts were ascertained to amount to 45,064*l.* When we consider that he had for nearly eighteen years enjoyed the salaries of First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer, together with an official house in Downing Street; that since 1791 he had been Warden of the Cinque Ports, with a large salary and Walmer Castle; that he had no expensive elections; and that his habits were simple and unostentatious, this fact evinces an extraordinary amount of negligence as to his private affairs. His creditors soon became clamorous; and he was threatened with the seizure of his goods and furniture. The result was that in the autumn of 1801 a sum of 11,700*l.* was subscribed by Mr. Pitt's friends, for the payment of his more urgent debts. The list of subscribers, with the sums subscribed by each, is given by Mr. Rose: he himself contributed 1000*l.* It was called a loan; but no part of the money was ever repaid by Mr. Pitt himself, nor was it included in the sum of 40,000*l.* voted by Parliament after Mr. Pitt's death for the payment of his debts. It seems that an offer was made at this time to Mr. Rose by the King to contribute towards the discharge of Mr. Pitt's debts; but that the offer on being mentioned by Mr. Rose to Mr. Pitt, was declined by him. Mr. Rose was under the impression that the sum offered by the King was 30,000*l.*; but His Majesty, in a letter addressed to Mr. Rose in December 1809, stated that he had never mentioned any specific sum, and certainly had not in view one so considerable as that supposed by Mr. Rose. (Vol. i. p. 404–29.; vol. ii. p. 214–6, 236–7.)

Mr. Rose's Diary contains no entry for the year 1802 until the two last months. In November he joined Mr. Pitt at Bath, with whom he found Lord Camden and Lord Carrington. Mr. Pitt was now becoming gradually alienated from the Addington Government; and he had much discussion with his friends as to the course which he should take at the opening of the session for 1803.

'Nov. 15.—In the course of the discussion to-day I found Mr. Pitt much less reluctant about taking office. He at first urged to me the improbability of his being able, if he came in, to do anything of essential service to the country; to which I replied, I thought he might in the finances and settling the peace establishment; but above all, that a strong Government, in which the country would have confidence, and that would be respected abroad, would prevent a repetition of insults and injuries, which would otherwise be heaped upon us till we should be compelled to go to war; and that if it should not be able to avert that evil, it would be prompt in making the utmost exertions the country should be found capable of, at the first moment they could be made, which is evidently of the last importance.'

The plan devised at this time by Mr. Canning for inducing Addington to retire voluntarily from office,—of which 'Lord 'Malmesbury's Memoirs' contain a full account,—is noticed by Mr. Rose; but with an opinion that it was not likely to succeed, and that it would subject Mr. Pitt to certain suspicions of complicity.

Mr. Pitt was much annoyed by an article in the 'Times,' of December 2. 1802, attacking him for abandoning the King in the hour of danger, which he believed to originate with the Ministers. He even determined to write to Mr. Steele, then Joint Paymaster-General, to ask for an explanation; but upon Mr. Rose's representation as to the imprudence of this course, he desisted from his intention.

Those who hold that the impracticable scheme of a Suez Canal is not only practicable, but that it would, if executed, be ruinous to the interests of England, will be glad to find their opinion fortified by the authority of Mr. Pitt. Mr. Rose records a conversation with him in February 1803, upon the recent Report of Sebastiani to the First Consul.

'I was naturally led, in pursuing the subject, to talk of the importance of Egypt. We agreed that the possession of that country must, in one way or other, completely take from us the advantages we at present derive from our possessions in, and trade to, the East Indies. The facility that it would give to France to invade India with large armies carried down the Red Sea from Cosseir, where they could embark easily and have a perfectly safe navigation, during a considerable part of the year, to the Malabar coast, cannot be questioned. These armies they would be enabled, of course, to reinforce from time to time as they should find it necessary. In another point of view it appears to be within a probability that, with the spirit of enterprise so strongly manifested by the French lately, they would be very likely to attempt to make a large and navigable cut from the Red Sea to the Nile, either from Suez to Cairo, or more probably (as it would certainly be much more useful) from Cosseir

to the neighbourhood of Chennah*; in which attempt, if they should succeed, they would effectually bring the trade of India to Marseilles, and other ports in the Mediterranean, by carrying the commodities of that country through Egypt for probably about one-half the expense of our freight by the Cape of Good Hope.' (Vol. ii. p. 19.)

Mr. Rose's papers give a full account of the overture for a junction made to Mr. Pitt by Mr. Addington in March 1803, and of the rupture of the negotiation, when it seemed to be nearly completed. It accords substantially with the narrative derived from the Grenville papers and other recent publications†; and it adds several particulars, which, as the contemplated arrangements never took effect, it is unnecessary for us to repeat.

In the summer of 1803, there appeared an anonymous ministerial pamphlet, entitled 'a Few Cursory Remarks upon the 'State of Parties during the Administration of Mr. Adding-'ton.' Its author was a Mr. Bentley, who was said to have received information from the near connexions of the Minister; and it contained severe reflections upon the conduct of Mr. Pitt. The latter so much resented the publication, that, in answer to a letter from Lord Castlereagh, asking for his advice upon some question pending with the East India Company, he declined to hold intercourse with any member of the Government until the publication should be disowned by Mr. Addington. It was afterwards agreed that an answer to it should be composed by Mr. T. P. Courtenay (brother to the late Earl of Devon). Some full notes for his use were prepared by Mr. Rose, with further remarks by Mr. Pitt; the latter likewise engaged to superintend the work, to add fresh materials, and to suggest new arguments where he should find it necessary. This pamphlet appeared under the title of 'A Plain Answer to the 'Misrepresentations and Calumnies contained in the Cursory 'Remarks.'‡ The facts mentioned by Mr. Rose invest the latter publication with the character of a historical document.

Mr. Rose gives a full narrative of the negotiations which ensued upon the fall of the Addington Ministry, and the formation of Mr. Pitt's second administration in the spring of 1804.§ He confirms the statement that Mr. Pitt urged upon

* Chennah is on the right bank of the Nile, opposite to Denderah, and nearly due west of Cosseir.

† See Ed. Rev. vol. cvii. p. 146.

‡ Concerning these and other pamphlets called forth by the controversy, see 'Court and Cabinets of George III.,' vol. iii. p. 321.

§ See Ed. Rev. vol. cvii. p. 156.

the King the inclusion both of Lord Grenville and of Mr. Fox, and that the King consented with reluctance as to the former, but gave a positive refusal as to the latter. When Lord Grenville and his friends, in consequence of the exclusion of Mr. Fox, declined to join the new Government, Mr. Rose advised Mr. Pitt to abandon the attempt to form an administration. Mr. Pitt seemed at first influenced by his friend's arguments; but he ended by peremptorily rejecting this course. He reminded Mr. Rose of his having at the commencement of the negotiation entered into a positive engagement with the King that if, in a personal conversation, he should fail to persuade his Majesty to take Mr. Fox into the Cabinet, he would endeavour to form an administration without that gentleman. The following are Mr. Rose's reflections on the subject:—

'It is perfectly clear to me that in taking the determination Mr. Pitt has not acted on his own cool and temperate judgment, nor entirely on the advice of others, though he has been much influenced by the latter. He has in this, as in former instances, been a little led by resentment against political opponents. He certainly felt somewhat indignant at the conduct of those who drove him, and through him the King, so hard, on the admission of Mr. Fox immediately into the Cabinet; considering it as overbearing, inexcusable, and intolerable to him to be so dictated to. He was desirous, therefore, to show Lord Grenville and that set (whom he blamed by much the most) that he could form a government that could stand without them. At the same time I am persuaded he had strong opinions urged upon him as to the expediency of forming an administration upon the basis of such an arrangement as is now making, and I have not the slightest doubt but that Lord Melville is the principal adviser of that measure. His eager impatience for office was manifested beyond all dispute in the earlier negotiations; and he knew that, by the exclusion of Lord Grenville's and Mr. Fox's parties, he should be sure of obtaining his favourite object of being First Lord of the Admiralty, in which situation he will have full scope for all he is desirous of. The country may, and I hope will, be with Mr. Pitt, under a just impression that he is making a manly and well-principled struggle. If it should take that line I shall myself not despond of a very tolerable parliamentary support. Our greatest weakness will be in what I before observed, filling the offices usefully and creditably, and particularly with persons who will be able to assist essentially in debate; being now convinced that the King will be as anxious for the cause of the new Government as he ever was for any, seeing clearly that their continuance must be his best protection against what he must dread, and that in consequence thereof all those who consider themselves as his friends will be hearty, uniform, and steady in their support, which will make a most essential difference in any computation of strength.' (Vol. ii. p. 130.)

It will be observed that, so late as 1804, Mr. Rose reckons the 'King's friends' as an independent party in the House of Commons, and considers their cordial support as a material element in the success of Mr. Pitt's administration.

In the autumn of 1804, Mr. Rose had some interesting conversations with the King, partly at Weymouth and partly at his own house at Cuffnells, in Hampshire, where his Majesty passed a few days on his return from Weymouth. We must, however, be permitted to say, that these conversations were, to a great extent, of so confidential a nature, as to render it very questionable whether they ought, with certain exceptions, either to have been recorded by Mr. Rose, or to have been published by his editor. They were not communications made by the King upon ministerial arrangements, or other questions, of business, but familiar conversations during a visit to Mr. Rose. The following entry in his diary of September 30. shows the King's feelings with respect to Mr. Pitt's proposal for the admission of Mr. Fox into the Cabinet —

'After general expressions of regard to myself and of disappointment at not having seen me at the Council that was held ten days ago for the prorogation of Parliament, his Majesty gave me strong assurances of his favourable opinion of me, and of his real desire to talk with me. He then entered on what had passed on the change of Government in the spring; could not, he said, even at this distance of time, avoid stating to me his surprise at Mr. Pitt having entertained a thought of suggesting Mr. Fox forming a part of the Administration, and still more that he should have urged it with the earnestness that he did; especially as Mr. Pitt was the person who had proposed expunging Mr. Fox's name from the list of Privy Councillors. I answered that the point was an extremely delicate one for me to make even the slightest observation upon, and that the consideration of it having been long finally closed. I felt a still greater reluctance to say a syllable about it; but that I thought it due to Mr. Pitt to observe that I had certain ground for my conviction that in making the proposition to his Majesty, Mr. Pitt was influenced solely by a fixed opinion that the taking Mr. Fox into the Administration was likely to be attended with the best possible consequences to the country. His Majesty went on to say, that notwithstanding the determined opposition he made to Mr. Fox, he was pressed by Mr. Pitt to allow him to repeat the proposition before he left the closet; to which the King assented, though he assured Mr. Pitt it would be useless. His Majesty added, that he had taken a positive determination not to admit Mr. Fox into his counsels, even at the hazard of a civil war.' (*Ibid.* p. 155.)

The King spoke very openly to Mr. Rose about his Ministers, both past and present; his Majesty's remarks prove that he never had any favourite, and that while he preferred those who

were subservient and flexible instruments, he had no affection for them which blinded him to their faults. George III. not unfrequently used flattery for influencing others, but he seems to have been nearly inaccessible to its influence himself. With reference to the recent change of government he told Mr. Rose

'That finding from experience Mr. Addington not equal to the government of the country, he was extremely desirous of having Mr. Pitt again; that he had thought very favourably of Mr. Addington, but was much displeased at his having said (while the intercourse was going on with Mr. Pitt about the change of administration) that he knew his Majesty did not wish Mr. Pitt to come in; and that in consequence thereof he had resolved, in the event of a negotiation with Mr. Pitt breaking off, not to keep him (Mr. Addington) at the head of the Government.'

He said that Lord Hawkesbury was unfit for the office of Foreign Secretary, that Lord Auckland was an eternal intriguer, that he had never had any confidence in Lord Melville, or any friendship for him. His Majesty informed the latter that he was not surprised at his opposing the Addington Government, after having accepted a peerage from Mr. Addington, and having promised to support that Minister; and that he was not displeased at the effect of his opposition, because he was convinced of Mr. Addington's inability to conduct the Government, and was glad of any proceeding which tended to bring Mr. Pitt into office. He thought that Lord Sandwich, barring his Huntingdonshire jobs, had been a good First Lord of the Admiralty.

'About Lord Castlereagh there seemed to be in his Majesty's mind a considerable degree of indifference. He said, however, he was glad it was not proposed to make his Lordship Secretary of State*, as it might have led (from his Lordship having had much intercourse with, and influence over, the Irish members as Irish Secretary) to his putting himself at the head of an Irish party, as Lord Melville had done at the head of a Scotch one.

'Lord Wellesley was spoken of by his Majesty as having considerable merit in the conduct of affairs in India, but as inflated with pride, and with his own consequence; assuming to himself the exclusive merit of all that had been done in the East, and demanding ceremonious respect much beyond what was due to his station. That when he had more than once been reminded that he was exacting

* Lord Castlereagh retained for a time under Mr. Pitt the office of President of the India Board, which he had held under Mr. Addington, but he was appointed Secretary of State for War and Colonies in July, 1805.

from those about him more than the King did, his Lordship replied, "Then the King is wrong; but that is no reason why I should im- "properly relax also." His Majesty added, "when he returns *, his "head will be quite turned, and there will be no enduring him."

'On mentioning the Chancellor's [Lord Eldon's] name, he spoke of him without using any terms of affection or warm approbation; said he did not understand why he took such short periods for prorogations, till the last long one, which appeared to be intended to avoid the necessity for Ministers going again to Weymouth to hold another Council. He said he expected his Lordship at the last Council, and had therefore provided lodging for him gratis at Mrs. Steward's, being aware that he sets some value on his money, which, he observed, is frequently the case with persons who acquire their fortunes themselves.'

While the King was at Cuffnells he took a ride with Mr. Rose, near the end of October, through one of the wildest parts of the New Forest, which caused his Majesty to express his feelings with regard to the beauties of natural scenery.

'On our return in the evening the King began the conversation again about the naked and dreary waste we rode over yesterday, abusing it as worse than any part of Bagshot Heath; and said on the whole he thought Windsor Forest incomparably a more beautiful one than this. To which I replied, it was fortunate in this as well as in other matters of taste, that all did not think alike. I suggested the disadvantage at which the King saw this country, but that in fine weather even the part of the forest he had seen had its beauties, as the ground was finely thrown about: to which his Majesty replied, he had no taste for what was called the fine wild beauties of nature; he did not like mountains and other romantic scenes, of which he sometimes heard much.'

While the King was at Cuffnells, near the end of 1804, he told Mr. Rose that he had nearly lost the sight of his right eye, and that it was with the greatest difficulty he could read a newspaper by candlelight with any spectacles he could get. (Ibid., p. 196.) The King's blindness soon after this time became so confirmed, that the speech at the beginning of 1805 was the last which he delivered to Parliament in person.

Mr. Rose's papers contain nothing relative to the short-lived reconciliation of Pitt with Addington, or to the resolution for impeaching Lord Melville, and the other events of the Session of 1805; but he has left a record of a visit to Weymouth in the autumn of that year, and of the result of Mr. Pitt's attempt to induce the King to consent to a negotiation for strengthening

* Lord Wellesley did not reach England, on his return from India, till the end of 1805.

his Ministry. The King told Mr. Rose that Mr. Pitt (who was still at Weymouth) had made very strong representations to him on the necessity of strengthening his government by the accession of persons from the parties of Lord Grenville and Mr. Fox, but that he was persuaded there was no necessity for such a junction; that affairs on the Continent wore a favourable appearance, and that there was a prospect of as good parliamentary support as in the previous Session. Mr. Rose replied that in the next Session the Government would be compelled to propose new taxes, which would try their strength far more than any measure of the preceding Session. He expressed moreover his conviction that if Mr. Pitt was prevented by illness from attending the House during two or three weeks, the Government must break down.

'I had not the good fortune, however, to make any impression whatever on his Majesty; on the contrary, I found him infinitely more impracticable on the point than last year when at Cuffnells. He then would have consented to admitting as many of the two parties before mentioned as Mr. Pitt should desire, with the exception only of Mr. Fox, and would not object even to him if employed on a foreign mission, or in any situation that would not render his readmission to the Privy Council necessary, as appears by my notes written at that time. But now the King states a positive determination against taking a single individual from the Opposition into the Administration, observing, in a manner that precluded any reply, "He could not trust them, and they could have no confidence in "him;" and added, "he was sure there was no necessity." To which I could only answer, I hoped most sincerely his Majesty would not find himself under a mistake, but that I felt it my duty to say I saw the matter in a less promising light, and that it appeared to me to be infinitely better for his Majesty to admit of a moderate accession of the persons to whom he objected, with Mr. Pitt as the head of the Administration, who has the good fortune to possess his Majesty's confidence, than to have the whole forced upon him by a struggle in Parliament, and a complete change in his Majesty's confidential servants effected. To this he would not listen at all, considering it a visionary apprehension.

'On revolving in my mind all that passed in this conversation, which lasted very nearly two hours without interruption, I have a perfect conviction that the positive determination now formed by the King against admitting a single man from the Opposition into Government, so directly contrary to the sentiments he repeatedly stated to me twelve months ago, has arisen from representations that have been made to him very lately, and from a combination of circumstances not to be mistaken. I have a firm persuasion that Lord Hawkesbury effected the change in his Majesty's opinions, aided

perhaps by Lord Mulgrave, and still more by the Chancellor [Lord Eldon].' (*Ibid.*, p. 200.) *

Mr. Pitt only survived this abortive attempt to strengthen his Government by a few months. On the 23rd of January, 1806, he died at his house at Putney, and his own dissolution was instantly followed by that of his Government. Mr. Rose confirms the authentic account, given in Lord Malmesbury's 'Memoirs,' of his patriotic exclamation on his death-bed.

'He saw no one after the Bishop [Tomline] had taken notes of his last desires, but Lady Hester [Stanhope], who went to his bedside in the evening. He at first did not know her, but afterwards he did and blessed her. Nor did he utter another word, except that about half an hour before he breathed his last the servant heard him say, "My country, oh, my country!"' (*Ibid.*, p. 233.)

Mr. Rose attributes Mr. Pitt's premature death, at the age of forty-seven, in a greater degree to labour and anxiety, and in a less degree to physical weakness and decay, than we believe the facts to warrant.

'Mr. Pitt sacrificed his life in the service of his country as much as Lord Nelson did. I foresaw what he would have to encounter when he undertook the Government in 1804; that the whole weight of it falling, as it inevitably would do, upon him, would be too much for his health and strength to stand. He bore up, however, under all the incredible fatigue that he underwent in the conduct of his own department, and of the War and Foreign Departments, occasionally assisting in those of the Commander-in-chief and the Admiralty, beyond my utmost hopes; and although he was sometimes indisposed (seldom indeed for a long interval without taking cordial medicines), he was, when at Cuffnells in September last, and when I left him at Weymouth in the same month, apparently as well, or nearly so, as I ever saw him: and from all I heard there was no failure in his health till the beginning of December, when, more from precaution than any other cause, he was advised to go to Bath, some symptoms of the gout having appeared. The waters there almost immediately threw the gout into his right foot, and soon after into the left; but on receiving the account of the armistice after the battle of Austerlitz, the gout quitted the extremities, and he fell into a debility which continually increased until it deprived the world of

* In a pamphlet entitled 'A brief examination into the Increase of 'the Revenue, Commerce, and Navigation of Great Britain during 'the Administration of Mr. Pitt,' published in 1806, Mr. Rose likewise bears witness to the efforts made by Mr. Pitt, and continued till within a few months of his death, to obtain the King's consent to the admission of Lord Grenville and Mr. Fox into his Administration. (P. 108.)

the man who appeared to have been born to save it. The physicians were decidedly of opinion that he died merely from a decay, and that there was nothing wrong in any of the vital parts.' (*Ibid.*, p. 234.)

The following remarks by Mr. Rose on Mr. Pitt's character deserve extraction at length, as being the testimony of a witness who, though he may have been partial from friendship, was nevertheless intimately acquainted with the subject of his description.

'With respect to Mr. Pitt, I can say with the sincerest truth that in an intercourse almost uninterrupted during more than twenty years, I never saw him once out of temper, nor did ever one unpleasant sentence pass between us; of which I verily believe there have been few, very few, so remarkable instances, where two persons have had the same constant intercourse on public affairs (in times too of the most trying difficulties respecting finances, internal government, and foreign politics), without the slightest disagreement having occurred, or a harsh, or even, to the best of my recollection, a hasty word used.

'His talents, the quickness of his perception, almost intuitive, his discerning judgment, the firmness of his mind, which secured to him the fullest advantage of that discernment in cases of the extremest public dangers and calamities, such as indeed had never occurred since the Revolution [of 1688], namely, the democratical exertions, prepared to be supported by an immense armed force, influenced by meetings, public and private, of those of the most dangerous principles and active minds, as well as by libels of a treasonable nature, the mutiny of the fleet, the stoppage of the banks, famine in the country, invasion threatened by an immense force of the enemy, brought down to their coast, opposite to ours, with ships collected sufficient to transport them. In short, no danger, however great, ever dismayed him or deprived him of the advantages resulting from the quickness of his conception. A certain shyness or reserve with persons he had little or no acquaintance with, and his general carriage (walking remarkably upright) were by many mistaken for pride, of which he had as little as almost any gentleman I ever knew; for in families, or with people with whom he was acquainted, his address and manner were the easiest and most pleasant possible. His temper, as I before observed, the sweetest I think I ever knew, on no occasion ruffled by any dangers, difficulties, or unpleasant occurrences, except in the House of Commons, where undoubtedly he sometimes, under considerable provocation, gave vent to his feelings; and when he did it was with wonderful effect, for his eloquence was tremendous as well as persuasive. Few could know him as well as myself. From Christmas 1783 to the time of his dissolution, I was in constant habits of the warmest affection and friendship, as well as business with him. Hardly three days passed without my seeing him throughout that period, except during the five or six weeks in the summer, and the three weeks at Christmas, which I used to

spend at Cuffnells in the year. He hardly ever had the slightest thought about himself, his mind was wholly occupied with his country. His most uncommon share of good-nature occasioned his giving way sometimes to solicitations he should have resisted, especially with regard to peerages, of which he was liberal to a most unfortunate extent; but so far from gaining political strength thereby, I am perfectly sure he suffered by them, for it frequently happened that an enemy was chosen in the room of the newly created peer. In the administration of finances, and in the management of the public purse, it is not possible any one could be more entirely pure and disinterested. He abolished all contracts whatever, all purchases by commission, all private distributions of loan, and every other species of money influence, which was in truth at my solicitation. He abolished also the sinecure employments in the customs, numerous and valuable. He established a sinking fund in the year 1786 (when the finances were in so wretched a state that no other man would have entertained a thought of the kind), which amounts now to more than eight millions a year, and which in no public exigency would he allow to be touched. These are only some of his internal arrangements and measures of domestic policy. In foreign politics he was intelligent, able, and indefatigable. I have heard several of the Foreign Ministers say they would rather discuss intricate matters with him than with any other man they ever knew; particularly Count Woronzow, who I verily believe laments his loss most deeply. The last union of Austria and Sweden with Russia, in which Prussia had actually undertaken to join, was accomplished absolutely by himself, and would have saved Europe, almost to a certainty, if it had not been defeated by the conduct of those who were entrusted with the command of the Austrian armies. The effect of these miscarriages has been already truly stated to have occasioned his death.' (*Ibid.*, pp. 234. 259.)

The ministerial revolution which ensued upon the death of Mr. Pitt, is described by Mr. Rose in the following terms: —

'Jan. 23. 1806. The Cabinet this day communicated to the King their unanimous opinion that it would be impossible, by any acquisition to the present Government, to form an Administration that could have a prospect of carrying on the public business in the present crisis; and therefore recommended to his Majesty most earnestly to send for Lord Grenville, in order to take his advice about forming a new one. In the evening Lord Hawkesbury said the King had received the communication with perfect temper and coolness, that his Majesty saw the necessity for following the advice offered to him, and had made up his mind to admit of such an Administration as should be recommended to him, without any exclusion. The promptitude with which that determination is taken may, I think, lead to a suspicion in some minds that Mr. Pitt had not made all the exertions he stated to his friends he had done, for prevailing with the King to admit Mr. Fox to his counsels; the certainty of which, however, is as clear to me as my own existence.' (*Ibid.*, p. 236.)

The inconsistency in the King's conduct here indicated is more apparent than real. He resisted as long as he was able; and, when resistance was impossible, he yielded. If Mr. Pitt had taken Mr. Rose's advice in 1804, and had declined to form a Ministry when the King refused to admit Mr. Fox and Lord Grenville refused to join, his Majesty would doubtless have accepted the terms to which he submitted in 1806.

Among Mr. Rose's papers are two letters from Sir Vicary Gibbs, and one from Mr. Perceval, written in September and October, 1806; from which it appears that the answer to the Report of the Four Lords on the Princess of Wales was composed by Mr. Perceval, and was revised by him, in concert with Sir Vicary Gibbs and Mr. Plumer.* There is likewise a letter from Mr. Canning, of February 1807, relative to the offer for a junction, made to him by Lord Grenville in the summer of 1806. The Administration of 1806 consisted of three sections, namely, the friends of Lord Grenville, the friends of Mr. Fox, and the friends of Mr. Addington. The Pittites were altogether excluded. When Mr. Fox's life was drawing to a close, Lord Grenville opened, through Lord Wellesley, a negotiation with Mr. Canning for his accession to the Ministry. It appears that Mr. Pitt had intended, if he had lived, to bring Mr. Canning into his cabinet as Treasurer of the Navy.† Lord Grenville's original offer was, a cabinet office for Mr. Canning himself, and a legal appointment for Mr. Perceval. To this was subsequently added a Privy Councillor's office for a person to be named by Mr. Canning. The proposal was declined by Mr. Canning, on the ground that it did not comprehend a sufficient number of the Pittite party.‡

Mr. Rose's papers contain much authentic information relative to the differences in the Cabinet during the summer of 1809, caused by the desire of Mr. Canning to effect the removal of Lord Castlereagh from the War Department, and his pretensions to become Prime Minister upon the resignation of the Duke of Portland.

* See Ed. Rev. vol. cix. p. 167.

† Mr. Rose, who heard this statement at the time from Mr. Sturges Bourne, disbelieved it. He thinks that so sudden an advancement would have been generally disapproved, and that Mr. Pitt would not have committed an act of such infatuation (Ibid., p. 249.). It is nevertheless confirmed by Lord Malmesbury ('Diaries,' vol. iv. p. 343.).

‡ Rose, vol. ii. p. 311. 'George Canning and his Times,' by Stapleton (1859), p. 96-102. 'Lord Malmesbury's Diaries,' vol. iv. p. 354.

'The important point' (says Mr. Rose) 'to which the breach that had unhappily taken place was to be imputed was the claim of Mr. Canning to be the leader of the House of Commons, attainable only by his being First Lord of the Treasury.' (*Ibid.*, p. 376.)

His objection to Lord Castlereagh had, according to Lord Malmesbury, taken its origin in a proceeding relative to the convention of Cintra, in November, 1808, of which Mr. Rose gives the following account: —

'Respecting that transaction itself Mr. Canning certainly had just and strong ground of complaint against his colleagues. He was in Leicestershire when the account of it arrived, and, without waiting for his opinion on the subject, they sent off the son of Sir Hugh Dalrymple, who brought the account, with an unqualified approbation of the measure; and Mr. Canning arrived in town just in time to have Captain Dalrymple stopped by telegraph on the road to Plymouth, and brought back to London, when a qualified censure was expressed on the Convention.' (*Ibid.*, p. 380.)

The following report of a confidential conversation with Lord Camden in October, 1809, on the causes of the recent duel between Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning, shows that the concealment from Lord Castlereagh of the intention to remove him from the War Department was intentional, but that the Duke of Portland, and not Mr. Canning, was primarily responsible for it.

'Lord Camden admits the communication to have been made to him as early as Mr. Canning states, the end of April; but so far from his being at liberty to acquaint Lord Castlereagh with it, it was made to him under the most solemn injunction of secrecy, respecting which he was so uneasy that, on the 29th of June, he wrote to the Duke of Portland to know whether he was in any mistake about that; to which the Duke answered the same day he was not, stating that he had most strongly enjoined him to secrecy, in the hope that matters might be so arranged as to avoid the necessity of anything being said to Lord Castlereagh on the subject; his Grace taking upon himself, in the clearest terms, whatever blame might attach to the concealment. A further correspondence took place between Lord Camden and the Duke of Portland in July, begun by the latter on the same subject; his Grace continuing to press for silence on it till the end of the Walcheren expedition, on the same ground as before. And at length, when the disclosure became indispensably necessary, Lord Camden made it to Lord Castlereagh on the 7th of September, without, however, letting him know how early the matter had been decided on, not conceiving it necessary that his Lordship's feelings should be wounded by a knowledge that his removal from office had been acquiesced in by his colleagues before the expedition had been set on foot, and that he had been allowed to conduct the whole of it when his official death-warrant was in their possession.

'Lord Castlereagh having thus been led to believe that the measure was only now adopted to strengthen the Government, agreed to resign, and declined to accept any other office offered to him, Lord Camden having pressed his own upon him, the Presidentship of the Council: and it was not till Lord Castlereagh was shown the correspondence of Mr. Canning by Mr. Perceval that he expressed any resentment or uncomfortable feeling on the subject. It was from that he learned how early his removal had been consented to by his Majesty and by his colleagues, and it was in that he met with passages which induced him to challenge Mr. Canning; a proceeding which I still think, even admitting some misconception on the part of Lord Castlereagh, his lordship was utterly unjustified in adopting.' (*Ibid.*, p. 421.)

'I omitted to mention that from the time Mr. Perceval showed Lord Castlereagh the correspondence, from whence he learned how early his removal from the Secretaryship had been acquiesced in by his colleagues, he had broken off all intercourse with Lord Camden, notwithstanding the very near connexion between them*; and that the latter had originally introduced him into political life, by making him his principal secretary in Ireland, and most closely uniting himself with him ever since. Indeed, during the course of the transaction which now creates the separation he had repeatedly expressed his anxious desire to resign the Presidency of the Council to him, or to make his resignation of that high office subservient to some other arrangement that might better suit his Lordship's views or wishes.' (*Ibid.*, p. 424.)

After the resignation of the Duke of Portland, the remaining Ministers obtained with difficulty permission to make overtures to Lord Grey and Lord Grenville. It seems that Lord Grenville, in consequence doubtless of the earnestness with which he had pressed the slight relaxation in favour of the Catholics in 1807, was more displeasing to the King than Lord Grey. The King repeatedly told Mr. Rose in the years 1808 9, that Lord Grenville was even more offensive to him than Mr. Fox ever was. (Ibid., p. 390.)

The advice given by Mr. Perceval to the King on this occasion is highly honourable to him, and shows that he did not intend the overture to Lords Grey and Grenville to be a mere piece of acting.

'Mr. Perceval told me that in the conversations he had with the King he dissuaded him earnestly from calling upon his new Ministers, if they should come into his service, to give any pledge against

* Robert, first Marquis of Londonderry, married first Sarah, daughter of the Earl of Hertford, and secondly Frances, daughter of Earl Camden, and sister of John, first Marquis Camden. Lord Castlereagh was the issue of the first marriage.

bringing forward the Catholic question, as it would be utterly impossible for them to do so without an absolute abandonment of character with the public. That the best security his Majesty could have in the present state of things against that question being carried would be the mixture of those who must continue to be against it, being a part of the new Government.' On which hope the King at length agreed to rest; but gave strong assurances that he would rather abandon his throne than consent to Catholic emancipation.' (*Ibid.*, p. 395.)

The peremptory refusal of Lords Grey and Grenville to negotiate with Mr. Perceval was naturally unpalatable to many of their followers. Sheridan, whom Mr. Rose met about this time at a public dinner in the city, expressed his feelings openly on the subject:

'He blamed the conduct of Lord Grey and Lord Grenville, and said that they had given the Government very great advantage by it; lamented that Lord Grey had not asked an audience of the King; and expressed a most decided opinion of the folly and madness of again stirring the Catholic question during the King's life, as well as the cruelty, adding that the two peers had had a pretty good assurance of the feelings of the country upon it.' (*Ibid.*, p. 420.)

When Mr. Perceval's Ministry was in process of formation, the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer was offered to Mr. Rose; who, after taking time to consider, refused it, chiefly because he considered it above his powers of parliamentary debate (Ibid., p. 412, 414, 423). It was offered at the same time to Lord Palmerston and Mr. Milnes, and refused by both.

Mr. Rose bestows high praise upon the manner in which Mr. Perceval conducted the proceedings for the establishment of a Regency at the end of 1810.

'Throughout the whole of the debate—not indeed in this instance only, but in every stage of the Regency business, from the first introduction of it—Mr. Perceval has conducted himself with a degree of talent, manliness, temper, and perseverance equal to anything I ever witnessed in Parliament, except that in eloquence he fell somewhat short of Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox; but upon the whole, combining all points, I am bound to acknowledge that I think Mr. Pitt, if he had been living, could hardly have produced more complete effect. Mr. Perceval's ability and his conduct, in all respects, have forced from his enemies an applause and approbation hardly ever bestowed by political adversaries.' (*Ibid.*, p. 472.)

The Bill constituting the Prince of Wales Regent, received the royal assent, by the Great Seal, on the 5th February, 1811. On the 27th January the physicians were confident of the King's ultimate recovery, though uncertain as to the period; and on

the 1st of February, in an interview of the Chancellor and Lord Liverpool with the King, his Majesty inquired whether the Prince of Wales intended to change the Government. In answer to this question Lord Eldon stated that, from the best information which Ministers could obtain, they believed this to be his intention. The King replied that he would restore his present servants, but he wished to have time, requesting that he might not be brought forward too soon. With this prospect of the King's speedy recovery, the Prince of Wales abandoned the design which he had formed for a change of Administration, and communicated his decision to Lord Grenville before the passing of the Regency Bill. From this period to the end of Mr. Rose's life in 1818, his papers contain nothing which requires notice.

Of Mr. Rose himself, this publication gives a favourable impression. He made his way in the official world substantially by his industry, ability, and knowledge of financial affairs. He formed no exaggerated estimate of his own powers: when raised to the post of Secretary to the Treasury, under the administration of Lord Shelburne, he refused to sit in Parliament, and when offered the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, in 1809, by Mr. Perceval, he declined it, from a distrust of his capacity for Parliamentary debate. As the supporter of Mr. Pitt, he held office during a large part of his life; but he cannot be accused of seeking it with avidity. He did his best in 1804 to induce Mr. Pitt, by calculations of the probable strength of the opposition in the House of Commons, to abandon his intention of forming a Government, when he was unable to secure the co-operation of Lord Grenville and Mr. Fox — advice which the event proved to have been wise and patriotic. He was Secretary to the Treasury at the time when the Government was to a great extent carried on, in detail, by a series of bargains with the patrons of close boroughs; but subject to this condition, his official conduct seems to have been pure and straightforward. He lived on intimate terms with Mr. Pitt, and after the death of the latter he was in confidential intercourse with other leading Ministers of the Pittite connexion. Hence, the diary, in which he recorded the events and conversations of the day, contains, (as our extracts have shown) valuable and authentic materials with respect to the springs and motives of ministerial changes which were unknown to the contemporary public. As such, it will always possess a historical value. His Observations on Mr. Fox's Historical work, of which there are reviews by Mr. Sydney Smith in the 14th and 18th volumes of this Journal, are now nearly for-

gotten. It is to be regretted that these papers have been edited in so slovenly and unintelligent a manner. We have not thought it worth while to interrupt the course of our remarks, to point out Mr. Leveson Vernon Harcourt's blunders; but in conclusion we shall insert a short selection from them at the foot of the page.*

* Vol. i. p. 308., for 'Mr. *Riley* Addington' read 'Mr. *Hiley* Addington.'

Vol. i. p. 393.: the editor, in speaking of the Catholic question and of the motives for Mr. Pitt's resignation in 1801, has this passage:

'It is probable that the report then current was correct, *and that Lord Castlereagh was the person who introduced the question into the Cabinet;* not from any hostility to the Church of England, of which there is no ground whatever to suspect him, but because, having been employed to bring about the Union, in his anxiety to accomplish the task assigned to him he had overstepped the bounds of discretion and encouraged hopes which he was not authorised to inspire.'

What the report then current was, we know not; but as Lord Castlereagh was secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant under Mr. Pitt's Ministry, and was not a Cabinet Minister, it is clear that he could not have introduced a measure into the Cabinet. The correspondence in the Cornwallis and Castlereagh collections shows plainly that Catholic emancipation was considered both by the Lord-Lieutenant and by Mr. Pitt, as the natural and almost necessary sequel of the Union. Mr. Rose's 'Diary' likewise proves that this opinion was deliberately entertained by the larger and abler portion of Mr. Pitt's Cabinet. There is, moreover, no ground for supposing that Lord Cornwallis and Lord Castlereagh at all exceeded their instructions from the Cabinet, in the assurances which they gave to the Irish Catholics during the pendency of the question of Union.

Vol. i. p. 312.: Lord Eldon is described in Mr. Rose's 'Diary' as having to resign the *Chief Secretaryship* of the Common Pleas. Read Chief Justiceship.

Vol. ii. p. 402.: Mr. Thornton mentioned 'his relation, Mr. *Mills*, 'member for Pontefract, as a man likely to be useful in office; a 'remarkably eloquent young man, certainly.' Read Mr. Milnes, father of the present member for Pontefract.

Vol. ii. p. 406.: Lord Bathurst informed Mr. Rose that 'he had 'appointed Mr. Hamilton, a first *courier* of Lord Harrowby's, to be 'his official under-secretary,' Read *cousin*. Mr. William Hamilton filled the office of Under Secretary in the Foreign Office with distinction; he was afterwards the British Minister at Naples; and he was well known, till the close of his life in 1859, as one of the most active trustees of the British Museum, and an enlightened connoisseur of classical antiquities.

ART. III.— *Histoire de la Réunion de la Lorraine à la France.* Par M. le Comte D'HAUSSONVILLE. 4 vols. Paris: 1859.

M. D'HAUSSONVILLE is well known in Europe as one of the most firm and courageous adherents to the cause of constitutional freedom in France; his descent from an ancient family of Lorraine has led him to study the annals of that province with care, and to feel a cultivated sympathy with the eventful history of his native soil. Accordingly, as might be anticipated, this is a book of no common merit and interest. Though its subject is one that tempts to episode, it displays, for the most part, the lucid arrangement which characterises the great historians of France; it describes personages and occurrences with considerable skill, if not with striking genius and insight; it notes accurately the causes of the events it details, without indulging in tedious philosophising; and if it does not evince great originality and power, it abounds in proofs of thought and research. The style is uniformly copious, easy, and graceful; and though it seems to us slightly wanting in animation, it never loses the tone of dignity and simplicity. In short, this work has been written on sound principles; it may fairly be said to exhaust the particular subject and to be a valuable addition to French literature. At the present time the interest of the acquisition of Lorraine is increased by more recent annexations to the French territory, and by the revival of the doctrine of 'natural 'frontiers;' for none of the adjacent provinces, which have successively been absorbed by France, maintained their independence longer, or defended it more stoutly, than the ancient territories of that illustrious House.

The history of Lorraine in the feudal ages does not fall within the scope of this work; but M. D'Haussonville has condensed it in an appendix, which is not the least interesting part of these volumes. On the final division of the empire of Charlemagne, Lorraine fell to the lot of Lothaire,—a fragment of that part of his heritage which lay between the frontiers of Charles and Louis. From Lothaire it passed to the House of Franconia, and Henry the Third, the greatest monarch of that House, assigned it to Duke Gerard of Alsace, to be held as a fief of the German empire. After having ruled Lorraine for several centuries, the line of Gerard ended in a daughter, Isabella, whose marriage

with Réné, Duke of Bar, united the duchies of Lorraine and Bar in their offspring. Lorraine being held from the emperors of Germany, and Bar being a fief of the crown of France, the dukes of Lorraine from this time became more or less involved in the disputes of these powerful rivals, though with remarkable wisdom and skill they usually managed to stand in neutrality between them. Réné the Second, however, — the King of the Troubadours, — one of the most interesting figures of the middle ages, inclined upon the whole to the side of France; he was the ally of Louis the Eleventh in his wars with Charles the Bold, and the people of Lorraine long related with pride how he had scattered the chivalry of Burgundy at Morat, and had mourned over the corpse of Charles before the walls of Nancy. From Réné descended Anthony the Good, who was brought up at the court of Louis the Twelfth, and aided him in his Italian wars; and as the first Duke of Guise was the brother of this prince, the connexion between the Houses of Valois and Lorraine became more direct from this period. In 1542 Duke Anthony obtained from Charles the Fifth a declaration of the independence of Lorraine: and before his death he sent his eldest son to be educated under the eye of Francis the First. Charles the Third of Lorraine was the heir of this duke, and when war broke out between France and the empire in 1552, he was brought, being still a child, by the Guises to Paris, and spent his early youth under their guardianship. In 1559 the bishopricks of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, which, although situated in the midst of Lorraine, had remained ecclesiastical fiefs of the empire, were annexed to France by the treaty of Château Cambresis. The work of M. D'Haussonville commences from this period, which he regards as the commencement of the final annexation consummated nearly two centuries later. At this time Charles the Third was still in Paris, in the midst of that circle of ominous splendour which gathered round the dark Italian queen and her myrmidons of the Houses of Guise and Lorraine.

M. D'Haussonville's picture of Lorraine at this period is well worth the reader's attention. The aspect of the country was that of Europe in the middle ages, — churches, abbeys, and castles overlooking towns emerging from barbarism, and districts as yet scarcely tamed by culture; but for the time the national organisation of the duchy was remarkable. In England, in France, in Spain, and in Germany the feudal system had almost died out; but in Lorraine it still flourished in full vigour, and penetrated the various institutions of the people. The dukes of Lorraine, though recently emancipated from the German

empire, still stood in the relation of vassals to the crown of France for the duchy of Bar. The effect of this long dependence had been that they had never succeeded in subduing the other orders of the state; and the old gradations of mediæval authority still shared the functions of government with them. When a duke of Lorraine was crowned at Nancy, he swore in the presence of the estates of his realm that he would maintain their ancient franchises; and these franchises were amply sufficient to form a real check upon his power. The dukes of Lorraine were limited in their prerogatives: they could not make laws without the States-General, their armies were merely the feudal militia, and they were unable to impose taxes without the assent of the nobility. The Church, also, was very powerful in Lorraine, for the clergy were completely independent of the crown, they held their lands from the archbishops of Treves, and their spiritual jurisdiction extended throughout the land. As for the noblesse of Lorraine, as in all feudal governments, it was the real depository of the sovereign power: it led the national armies, enacted the national laws, exempted itself from the national taxes, imposed them at its pleasure on the Commons, and, as was the case in all the great French fiefs, it monopolised the secular administration of justice. Beneath this nobility grew up the Tiers État of Lorraine; but though the mutual jealousies of the powers above them secured to the people a certain measure of freedom, and they cherished a strong love for their country, we are disposed to think that M. D'Haussonville gives too favourable a picture of their condition. It may be true that they generally loved their sovereigns; that they appear never to have risen up against their noblesse; that they clung to the idea of their national existence; that their annals do not record such scenes as the Jacquerie or Wat Tyler's insurrection; and that the games and festivals to which they were habituated were such as are natural to a light-hearted people. But they were ineligible to any high offices in the state; they were really unrepresented in the States-General, the third estate in that assembly being an official caste; they bore the entire burden of taxation, and justice was administered to them by a seigneurie, who, as these volumes prove, notoriously perverted it. Under this system of government, though feudalism in Lorraine may have been less odious than in other parts of Europe, it was not the less a severe and oppressive yoke upon the middle and lower orders of the people.

The reign of Charles the Third of Lorraine extended from 1559 to 1608. He was eminently gifted with the prudence and

sagacity which characterised the majority of his predecessors. Brought up, as he had been, at the feet of Catherine of Medicis, of Francis of Guise, and of Cardinal Charles,—and within the precincts of that baleful court, ever memorable for its crimes, its ambition, and its bigotry,—he might well have imitated at Nancy the policy which his House pursued in France. It would not have been strange had he proved an ambitious tyrant, who veiled dark schemes of personal aggrandisement under the cloak of religion, and who aimed at destroying the limitations of his power in the flames which he had kindled in the name of the Church. But, though Charles had the ability of the House of Guise, and once or twice in the course of his reign attempted stretches of arbitrary power, he was, on the whole, a wise and tolerant ruler, and saved Lorraine from the fearful scenes which made France an Aceldama during the wars of religion. Like all his family he was a strict Catholic, but he treated his Huguenot subjects with singular lenity, and so long as the House of Valois seemed destined to last, he abstained from mingling in the intrigues against it which the Guises planned in the name of Catholicism. The result was that, while France was torn in pieces by the evil spirit of religious discord, while the massacre of Vassy followed the conspiracy of Amboise, while the streets of Paris were red with the blood of Saint Bartholomew's day, and Frenchmen slaughtered each other at Jarnac and Montcontour, Lorraine enjoyed a season of repose, and its sovereign ruled a united people. Under this mild and comparatively enlightened government, Lorraine grew apace in affluence, its fairs were multiplied, and its manufactures flourishing, and its people could truly boast, that while famine and war raged outside their frontiers, 'their garners were full and plenteous with 'all manner of store, and that there was no leading into cap-'tivity or complaining in their streets.'

Eventually, however, Charles the Third was drawn into the vortex of anarchy and bloodshed into which France herself had fallen. He had married the Princess Claude of Valois, and when the male line of Valois was about to fail in the person of the feeble Henry the Third, Charles joined the League against Henry of Navarre, in the interest of his son Prince Henry. Yet, despite the entreaties of Queen Catherine and of his cousin the famous Balafré, he was never a zealous adherent of the League, and he adopted this alliance rather with a view to gain inferior and secondary objects, than in the hope of being the father of a king of France. When these objects had been secured by the annexation of some fortified

towns to Lorraine, he began gradually to withdraw from the League; and, though his son was at the battles of Arques and Ivry, and the double cross of Lorraine was to be seen to the last amongst the banners of the Catholic chiefs, he appears to have anticipated the issue of the contest, and before its close had negotiated with the victor. In fact he was too sagacious not to perceive that, when Henry the Fourth had adopted the popular faith, the cause of the Guises had become desperate, and he had no wish to join in a wild attempt to subjugate France for Philip the Second.

His attention was now directed to the objects of protecting Lorraine against the House of Bourbon, which he felt was naturally hostile to him, and of securing his independence on the side alike of France and Germany. The prospect before him was not encouraging, for the fall of the Guises had removed the props on which he had rested the fortunes of his duchy, and his policy had not been calculated to propitiate the princes of the Houses of Spain or Austria. But he steered his course with great prudence in these difficult circumstances, and skilfully adapted his conduct to restore Lorraine to a safe position. Having made peace with Henry the Fourth, he secured his alliance by a marriage between Prince Henry and Catherine of Bourbon. At the same time he cultivated friendly relations with the Empire and Switzerland, he promoted Catholicism in his dominions in the hope of conciliating the Catholic Powers, and he left nothing undone to strengthen his fortresses and to ensure the loyalty of his subjects. He foresaw that a time was coming when France would array her forces against Spain and Austria, that in this strife Lorraine would be a spoil of war and a tempting mark for French ambition, and that, in a contest which in part would be one of religion, the Houses of Bourbon and of Guise could never be in alliance. As the policy of Henry the Fourth tended more and more to this issue, Charles, though reluctantly, began to incline to the side which he felt would necessarily be his own. He drew nearer to the Catholic Powers, and, though still at peace with his formidable neighbour, took every precaution against the storm which he saw on the horizon of Europe. That storm, however, was not yet to burst, and he died at Nancy in 1608, with his heritage as yet unscathed by war and flourishing under his wise government. Two years afterwards the dagger of Ravaillac put an end to the career of Henry the Fourth, changed the entire face of European politics, and retarded for a time the mighty struggle which broke out a few years later in the War of Thirty Years.

The history of Lorraine flowed on in bright but treacherous smoothness. Charles the Third was succeeded by his son Prince Henry; and this Duke, though somewhat indolent and profuse, adhered to his father's general policy. He took care not to break with the House of Bourbon, and even renewed his alliance with it; but he placed his trust in that of Austria, which, in conjunction with that of Spain, had acquired a marked predominance in Europe. In his time, the contest foreseen by Charles the Third appeared beyond the chances of politics, and a Duke of Lorraine might reasonably expect that a period of prosperity awaited his people. An old ally of Philip the Second, and a scion of the orthodox House of Guise, might think that Lorraine, if exposed to France, would prove the outwork of an impregnable citadel; and Duke Henry, in his palace at Nancy, surrounded by a brilliant noblesse, and popular with his prosperous subjects, felt easy as to the foreign relations of his country. The state of his family, however, gave him disquietude; his marriage with Catherine of Bourbon had proved unfruitful: but, by a second wife of the House of Gonzaga, he had become the father of two daughters, Nicole and Claude, the elder of whom he had named his successor. This princess — destined to evil days — had been betrothed to Louis the Thirteenth, at the request of Henry the Fourth; but Mary of Medicis had broken off the match in favour of the Infanta of Spain; and the duke now wished to bestow her upon a bastard of the House of Guise, in the hope that this ignoble alliance would assure her an undivided authority. The project, however, was resented by the noblesse of Lorraine, and the duke's brother Francis, Count of Vaudemont, took advantage of this feeling to contend that the Salic law applied to Lorraine, and that his son Prince Charles was heir to the dukedom. A quarrel broke out between the brothers, which threatened to end in civil war; and although Henry agreed to a compromise, by giving his daughter in marriage to the prince with an assurance in favour of her title, this affair threw a cloud on his later years, and filled him with profound anxiety. Prince Charles did not conceal his contempt for his wife, and had already shown signs of recklessness and folly; and the old duke was often heard to exclaim mournfully, 'that 'evil days awaited his child and his people.' He died in 1624: and 'in his grave,' so wrote an aged seigneur of Lorraine, 'was 'buried the joy of being one of his subjects.'

Prince Charles, who, in the right of his wife, became Charles the Fourth of Lorraine, was to his house what Paris was

to that of Priam, what Sextus was to the race of Tarquin. M. D'Haussonville, we think, has been too lenient with a character, which, if endowed with a soldier's courage, and not without some military genius, was cruel, tyrannical, false, and unwise,—the worst type of that fierce and faithless generation which mingled in the scenes of the Thirty Years' War, and in the bloody comedies of the Fronde. The eye is allured by his stately figure upon the canvas of Vandyke, and the many wrongs which he endured may claim for him a passing sympathy; but it is only just that his numerous faults should incur the censure of history. In our eyes, Charles the Fourth was the only prince of his House entirely devoid of greatness; for his character and his policy were utterly devoid of truth. The renown of Francis of Guise and the wisdom of Charles the Third might have failed to assure the safety of Lorraine in the tremendous strife of 1635—1659: but they would not have challenged fate by treachery; they would not have lost every ally by folly; they would not have stood alone in the midst of enemies by pursuing a career of senseless inconsistency. Still less, at the very crisis of the national independence, would they have alienated the hearts of loyal subjects, who had bled and suffered in their cause, or have struck down the liberties of their people, for the sake merely of impotent ostentation. Such, however, was the public conduct of Charles the Fourth: his private life was a long succession of vulgar amours, of vain parade, and of feats, half mountebank, half quixotic; he broke the heart of every woman that trusted him: and he was never more zealous in intrigue than when he sought to thwart his own kindred at the expense of the family honour and consideration. To quote the character given of him by a contemporary writer:—

'Ci-git un pauvre roi sans terres,
Il fut jusqu'à ses derniers jours
Peu fidèle dans ses amours,
Et moins fidèle dans les guerres;
Il donna librement sa foi
Tour à tour à chaque couronne;
Et se fit une étroite loi
De ne la garder à personne.
Trompeur, même en son testament,
De sa femme il fit une nonne,
Et ne donna rien que du vent
A Madame de Lillebonne.
Il entreprit tout au hasard;
Il se fit blanc de son épée;
Il fut brave comme César;
Et malheureux comme Pompée.

> Il fut toujours persecuté,
> Par sa faute et par son caprice;
> On le déterra par justice,
> On l'enterra par charité.'

Charles the Fourth began his reign in 1624; and his first public acts were to depose his duchess, despite his guarantee of her title, to seize the entire administration of affairs, and, on a false and ridiculous charge, to send two of his uncle's servitors to the stake. He then proceeded to invade the privileges of the noblesse, in the hope of making his crown absolute; and shortly afterwards he joined a league against France, in which England, Savoy, and Austria had conspired with a part of the French nobility and the Huguenots. True policy would never have allowed a Duke of Lorraine to attack France; yet a more profound politician than Charles the Fourth might have taken this step in the then state of Europe. Richelieu manifestly aimed at renewing the great scheme of Henry the Fourth, at curbing the arrogance of Spain and Austria, at breaking down the league of Catholic autocracy, and at restoring France to her true place among the leading Powers of Europe. It was a part of this policy to annex Lorraine as an important outwork upon the Rhine; and the Cardinal had already shown himself eager to pick a quarrel with Charles the Fourth. But as yet this purpose was far from its accomplishment: France was weak with intestine strife, and abandoned by her former allies; the throne of Louis the Thirteenth was not secure; the extreme Catholics and Huguenots were alike hostile to the Cardinal, and were backed by several of the leading nobility: the executive was beset on all sides by treason and violence: and Austria and Spain, with strength apparently irresistible, were crushing opposition in Germany and Italy. A Duke of Lorraine might have thought with some reason that this was a time to nip the designs of Richelieu in the bud, and to avert a peril from his dominions by falling on France while her power was as yet undeveloped, and England had joined her foes. But these considerations had no weight with such a prince as Charles the Fourth; and it is to the influence of the Duchesse de Chevreuse, one of the fair and faithless Amazons of the Fronde, who had given Charles a brief tenure of her charms and her heart, that we must ascribe his first rupture with France and his first display of ill-reasoned ambition. The result of this confederacy is well known: the arm of Austria was stayed by irresolution; the English fleet, having made a descent on the French coast, was beaten off; the forces with which Charles had menaced Champagne were paralysed by a superior army; and the fall of La Rochelle and the Italian campaign of Louis

the Thirteenth proved to Europe that France was about to resume a formidable position. The Duke of Lorraine might have learned a lesson from these events; but they seem to have had no effect on him; and he made peace in 1629 without any fixed resolve to keep it, though he knew that Richelieu was his enemy, and would scan his faith with severe scrutiny.

Within three years Charles was again involved in a series of actions hostile to France, which reveal his senseless and faithless nature. He owed homage to Louis as Duke of Bar, but refused to render it in the name of his duchess, and subsequently altogether evaded it,—a step which afforded Richelieu a plea to declare the duchy forfeited. He gave an asylum in Lorraine to Gaston, Duke of Orleans, whose whole life was a succession of plots against the Cardinal, which he had neither power nor ability to carry out, and the duke soon persuaded his reckless host to enter into his traitorous machinations. In 1632 Gaston married a sister of Charles the Fourth, a marriage which gave high umbrage to Louis, and the little court at Nancy became the scene of secret and most perilous designs against the king and the government of Richelieu. France as yet had not joined in the Thirty Years' War; but the Cardinal had signed the famous treaty with Gustavus Adolphus, which brought him to the aid of German Protestantism, and was about to place France in hostility to the Catholic Powers. While the conqueror of Leipsic was over-running Germany, and sweeping Tilly and Wallenstein before him, Spain and Austria, with their Catholic allies, though as yet not openly at war with France, caught eagerly at any means of weakening her power, and especially of subverting the statesman whose hand they saw in the Swedish alliance. These means were found in the league between Gaston and Charles, who, from the vantage-ground of Lorraine, collected an army on the French frontiers, inflamed the different sources of disaffection in France by emissaries supplied with money and arms, filled Paris with libels against the Cardinal, and welcomed the prospect of a general confederacy against the king and his great minister. Besides this, Charles had formed the wild scheme of measuring swords with the Lion of the North, and, as he had fought bravely at the battle of Prague, his uncle Maximilian of Bavaria offered to give him 20,000 troops if he would take the field against the ally of France. Regardless of results, the duke embraced the offer without delay, and he had already crossed the Rhine at the head of his forces, to join the Bavarian army at Donawerth, when the news arrived that the King of France had invaded Lorraine, and that the French army was in possession of the country.

This event, in the words of the old historians, 'was the be-'ginning of great mischiefs,' and henceforth the chronicler of Lorraine pursues a path of sorrow and desolation. The treaty which Charles agreed to on this occasion annexed to France a portion of Lorraine,—but it only tempted him to defy its obligations. The French generals had scarcely evacuated his territories when he engaged in fresh plots with his brother-in-law, who, in concert with Montmorency, was meditating fresh acts of treason. At the same time he was assured by Montecuculi, who had come as an envoy to the court at Nancy, that if he would attack the Swedish armies, the Catholic Powers would invade France, and restore Lorraine in its full integrity. Charles instantly set his troops in motion, and some levies of the Duke of Orleans came in contact with a French battalion, which they put to rout with great slaughter. Louis, deeply incensed, now entered Lorraine at the head of an overwhelming force; and, having overrun it in a few days,—a triumph which Richelieu ominously remarked, 'was prophetic of the fate of the 'duchy,'—he extorted fresh concessions from Charles, and became master of three of his most important strongholds. Even this, however, brought no warning to a mind ever ready to brave fate and scorn experience. In 1633 the Duke of Orleans left France for Brussels, and when there, he persuaded Charles, for the third time, to countenance his schemes against Louis and Richelieu. Simultaneously, in contempt of his last treaty, Charles attacked a Swedish force at Pfaffenhofen, and it became evident that Spain and Austria were to have him as an ally in the strife with France, which was becoming imminent. Once more, at the pressing instance of Richelieu, who saw the value of the occasion, the troops of Louis were marched into the duchy, and Charles was made to feel by a bitter experience the results of his repeated treachery. Lorraine again was occupied by the French armies; they ravaged it with reckless cruelty; its fortified places and towns were dismantled, that it might be open to future inroads; and when the Duke, terrified and driven to extremities, sought to make peace with the pitiless Cardinal, he was informed that Nancy must be yielded to France as a guarantee of future submission. Severe as these terms were, he was forced to succumb, and in 1634, for the first time, the lilies of the Bourbons floated over the capital of Lorraine.

But the net in which Charles had entangled his country was not to be broken by treaty or submission. The king had resolved to punish his treachery, and two decrees of the Parliament of Paris annulled the marriage of his sister with Gaston, and

declared the duchy of Bar escheated. The Cardinal, determined to 'bridle Lorraine' in the mighty strife he was about to commence, on various pretexts seized its strongholds, while the garrison at Nancy overawed resistance. It was vain to struggle against such foes, and Charles hastily abandoned Lorraine with an array of faithful men-at-arms, who chivalrously followed his broken fortunes, abdicated in favour of his brother Francis, and resolved to claim protection from the emperor. Though less like a sovereign than a leader of guerillas, he was welcomed at the camp of the King of Hungary; and on the bloody field of Nordlingen, where he commanded the troops of the German Catholics, he displayed remarkable ability and valour. As this battle threatened to place Germany at the feet of Ferdinand and Philip the Fourth, Richelieu was compelled at length in 1635 to bring France into the field. The war raged throughout the vast circle between the Niemen and the Rhine, the Baltic and the Mediterranean, and, in its varying and tragic phases, Lorraine was occasionally a point of importance. The Cardinal, true to his vigilant policy, determined to convert that bastion of Austria into an outpost of the French monarchy, and with this object he spared no pains to efface the image of the independence of the duchy, to cut it off from the past by destructive severity, and to terrify it into complete submission. During the next few years the history of Lorraine unfolds a series of wrongs and suffering such as, it was said, 'Jerusalem never witnessed.' Disregarding the illusive abdication of Charles the Fourth, Louis had driven Francis from his dominions, had attempted to annul his marriage with Claude, the second daughter of Duke Henry, and had carried off the Duchess Nicole to Paris, where she remained in strict though honourable captivity. In the meantime the franchises of the province were pronounced extinct; it was placed under a French judicature; a swarm of French tax-gatherers ate up its substance, and treated the people with odious oppression; and the French armies, living at free quarters on the noblesse, and occupying the fortified towns, kept the people under a yoke of iron. And yet these things were as nothing to what was suffered whenever the ebb and flow of the great continental struggle brought war and havoc within the country. More than once ferocious bands of Croats, from the steppes of Hungary and Transylvania, burst across the Rhine upon its valleys, and the name of Sweden is still associated in Lorraine with the memory of the burnings, the slaughter, and the sacrilege committed by the pikemen of Bernard of Saxe-Weimar. The cloud of smoke arising from pillaged towns, the fair

promise of the vintage trodden under foot, the altars of religion desecrated, the horrors of war in their darkest forms, and the more hideous scenes of its revelry and excesses,—such were the sights which, during several years, were too often seen in the unhappy country. It is needless to add that these atrocities were repeated by the armies of occupation, and that the levies which Charles sometimes drew from his dominions were not slow to aid in the work of destruction. 'No one 'would believe what we have seen, and yet we set down what 'we have seen;' so runs a chronicle of the time, and these scenes, though on a lesser stage, appear to have rivalled in horror the devastation of the Palatinate.

We shall not detail at any length the adventures of Charles the Fourth in these years, though they fill a large space in the volumes before us. The battle of Nordlingen had made him a soldier of the Empire; and from 1635 to 1641, he took an active part in the great contest. In 1637, with the Cardinal Infant, he planned the invasion of France from the Netherlands; but he did not join in the brief and brilliant inroad which brought the standards of Spain to Pontoise, and fluttered the Parisians of that generation. He fought with varying success and discomfiture against the armies of Bernard of Saxe-Weimar, and led his faithful soldiery of Lorraine into the wastes and forests of Saxony and Pomerania. With Gallas, he menaced Condé in Burgundy, and repulsed the Cardinal La Vallette in Franche Comté; and on one occasion, having penetrated into Lorraine, he gave such alarm to Louis the Thirteenth, that the noblesse of the *arrière ban* were called out, and the king set forth at their head to confront him. Charles certainly showed ability in these campaigns, but he had not the parts of a great captain; his pride, faithlessness, and want of sense soon alienated allies from one who was not of paramount importance to them. Though with nothing like a regular army, he insisted upon sovereign rank in the confederacy; he declined to range his troops under the imperial standard, or to entrust them to such men as Gallas and Piccolomini; and he soon made it appear that his only object was, to avail himself of the Empire and Spain, as instruments to recover his duchy. The cool and selfish politicians at Ratisbon, the haughty and stern commandants at Brussels, and the experienced chiefs of the Austrian armies, disliked the self-willed exile, who treated them with reckless disdain, and thought of them only as auxiliaries to his half-clad and starving battalions. At this juncture, also, Charles had committed an act—in keeping with his whole life—which had given great scandal to the Catholic world, and especially to His

Most Catholic Majesty. Beatrix de Custance, one of the many mistresses of the duke, had obtained such a dominion over him, that he was induced to repudiate his duchess openly, and to marry her rival without the papal sanction. Charles had steadily insisted on continuing this connexion, notwithstanding the protests of Ferdinand and Philip, of the Holy See, and of Prince Francis; and Beatrix was often seen with him at the head of his troops, who gave her the nickname of his '*femme de campagne.*' Such conduct, of course, was very uncanonical: and Philip having resolved to deal with it as it deserved, the Archbishop of Mechlin was directed to pronounce an anathema against the ducal bigamist. Charles, already discontented, was so exasperated by this censure, which was placarded on all the churches of the Netherlands, that he resolved to break with his allies; and having found a Mentor, at the moment, in his old mistress Madame de Chevreuse, who was just then given to French interests, and showed no rigour to Beatrix, he consented, in 1641, to make his peace with Louis and Richelieu, and to pledge his sword to his bitterest enemies.

On this occasion, the duchies of Lorraine and Bar were again put in the hands of Charles, and although the conditions of the treaty were severe, he had no reason to complain of them. This picture of his return to his dominions is significant of the still fervent loyalty of his people, and still more so of their semi-feudal manners: —

'Notwithstanding the ruin caused by the war, triumphal arches rose for him in every town, and the burgesses welcomed him in holiday attire. Entire villages turned out in haste to meet him, each with a device and banner in front; and, at the boundaries of the different parishes on his way, the clergy received him in full procession, with the crucifix and holy water. One curate even bore the Host before him; but Charles dismounted on seeing this, and respectfully reconducted the simple man to his church. The feeling everywhere was one of enthusiasm; but it knew no bounds when the duke approached the capital which had been deprived so long of his presence. Nancy issued from her walls in one crowd to see him, and the inhabitants of the neighbourhood flocked towards Malgrange to catch, if possible, a glimpse of his countenance. So great was the press, many were almost stifled. Women of rank struggled towards him to kiss his boots, and to pluck the embroidery from his purpoint. Some indeed, says Don Calmet, tore his garments, and even snatched at his beard and head to get some of his hair for a sacred relic. The appearance of Beatrix added to the general excitement. Before her was proudly borne a beautiful child, the first-fruits of her union with Charles, who afterwards became the Princesse de Lillebonne. This object touched the hearts of the bystanders so deeply, and espe-

cially those of the peasant women. Many of these, we are told by the Marquis of Beauveau, from whom chiefly we have borrowed these details, thought it the highest homage they could offer the duke to exclaim with loud voices and clasped hands, "God bless "our sovereign liege of Lorraine, his two wives, and his young "child."'

This season of gladness, however, was only shortlived, and Lorraine was ere long to renew her mourning. Neither experience of the power of France, nor the sense of what was due to his people, arrested Charles the Fourth in his career of folly. By a trick he evaded paying homage to Louis for the duchy of Bar; and he was no sooner in possession of Lorraine than he began to infringe his last treaty. He menaced France with considerable levies, repaired and armed his frontier fortresses, and commenced plotting with the Count de Soissons, one of the many feudal conspirators against Richelieu. At length he broke openly with France, and having hurriedly evacuated Lorraine, he went over to the Spanish camp. This was, of course, only playing into the hands of the Cardinal, and when the battle of Marfée had disposed of De Soissons, a French army again marched into the heart of Lorraine, and held it again in pitiless bondage. The unhappy province was once more exposed to the curse of fiscal and military oppression; while Charles, at the head of a motley force, collected chiefly from his dominions, plunged into the chaos of anarchy and bloodshed which closed the drama of the Thirty Years' War.

From this time until the treaty of Westphalia, there is little of interest in the history of Charles. He fought well in the series of bloody campaigns which, from 1641 to 1648, slowly taught the Houses of Austria and Spain that the sceptre had departed from them, and he defeated a French army under De Rantzen at the brilliant skirmish of Tutlingen. Always at the head of the wild levies which he gathered round the banners of Lorraine: occasionally pouncing on his wasted country, and levying contributions from it; now foremost in the struggle with Tortenson, as he gradually penetrated the heart of the Empire, and now stemming the strength of Condé and De Guébriant along the frontiers of the Low Countries, he proved that, at least, he understood the wretched trade of a soldier of fortune. But he was no longer trusted by his allies; his energy, his losses, and his fitful ability did not atone for his well known recklessness and levity; and when the arms of Spain began every where to give way before the redoubtable strokes of France, the fanatical chiefs of the Spanish forces ascribed their ruin to the anathematised outcast. Meantime, as her power advanced

steadily, the grasp of France on Lorraine tightened; and whenever Charles approached the Rhine to recruit or equip his wasted forces, he heard piteous tales of the misery and desolation inflicted on his people. Even yet, however, he had not learned that perfidy is the worst of expedients, and from the centre of the Spanish camp he made advances to Anne of Austria and Mazarin, when death had removed his great enemy, Richelieu. The Duchesse de Chevreuse, who with other exiles, had now returned to the court of France, was his plenipotentiary in this business; but although she pleaded his cause with warmth, the new rulers of the House of Bourbon gave him little hopes of a reconciliation. Simultaneously, Charles had caused fresh scandal by ill-treating the hapless Beatrix de Cusance, and stooping to a plebeian mistress; and this conduct, added to his wanton faithlessness, increased his ill repute at Madrid and Brussels. The emperor, too, had abandoned the duke, who had deeply offended his German pride, and had not lately been of use to him; the result was, that at the treaty of Westphalia, no terms were made in favour of Charles, and that Lorraine was left in the hands of France, while its sovereign, clinging to the armies of Spain, which still maintained the unequal conflict, felt himself deserted in the midst of those armies, and despised by all the Powers of Europe. It is said that, at this time, a wild thought crossed him, that he would enter the lists against Oliver Cromwell, and at the head of the Catholic Confederates, would confront the fierce and fanatical host which was about to carry havoc into Ireland.

As the star of Spain rapidly declined before the rising sun of Louis the Fourteenth, the yoke of France upon Lorraine became more settled, and the fortunes of Charles of course grew darker. But during the transient anarchy of the Fronde, he had another chance of subduing fate, out of which he might have plucked safety, but in his hands it only ended in fresh disasters. When the union of the noblesse and the Parliament of Paris had driven the Queen and Mazarin from the kingdom, and France, in the throes of civil strife, lay exposed for an instant to her enemies, Charles actually penetrated to the capital twice, and, Brennus-like, held its destiny on his sword. But his usual want of faith and prudence deprived him of the advantages of this position, and, in the eyes of the courts of France and Spain, only added to the list of his treacheries. Charles, though a professed ally of Spain, and actually fighting with her armies, was at this time anxious to side with France, whose growing strength he fully appreciated, and accordingly he shrunk from

striking a blow which he well knew would not be forgiven. As regards the parties of the Fronde, he adhered to neither, for he dreaded Mazarin and disliked the Prince of Condé, to whom the Cardinal had given three fortresses in Lorraine; and thus, while he flattered both with promises, and paraded his soldiery before the Louvre amidst the shouts of the thoughtless populace, he resolved not to throw his weight into the balance, and to trust to the chapter of accidents for success. The consequence was, that he was distrusted by all sides equally; that his inroads on Paris ended in nothing; and that, upon his return to the court of Brussels, he found himself in the midst of suspicious allies or avowed enemies. Soon afterwards, when the Prince of Condé, with the baffled warriors of Saint Antoine, had gone over to the Spanish camp, a quarrel between him and Charles broke out; and as the Spanish Viceroy was willing to court the victor of Rocroi, and disliked and despised his worthless ally, he formed the design of getting the duke out of the way, and of forcing his troops to serve under the Spanish standards. Accordingly, in 1654, Charles was suddenly arrested at Brussels; his brother Francis was placed in command of his levies as a mere subordinate of Philip the Fourth, and the ill-fated duke was left to curse his fortune within the walls of the castle of Toledo. Here he soon heard that his soldiers, indignant at his treatment, and chafing at the change of masters, had deserted to the French armies; and as this defection was of course attributed to him, it only closed more firmly the bars of his prison. Notwithstanding the protests of his deserted wife, Nicole, who, with the noble heroism of her sex, drew near to him in the hour of danger, and pleaded his cause at half the courts of Europe, he remained a captive till the peace of the Pyrenees had closed the strife between France and Spain.

In the negotiations before this peace, little regard was paid to the interests of Charles, and Bar was annexed to the crown of France, with a military road across Lorraine. The duke protested against these terms, it is needless to say with what success; but soon afterwards, on his visiting Paris, he swore allegiance to Louis the Fourteenth, and the Duchy of Bar was restored to him. Great as his sufferings had been he was still a sovereign; he was master of a loyal people who had encountered ruin through his follies, yet who still loved him with deep attachment; and he had had a stern experience of the results of dealing treacherously with powerful neighbours. He was also once more among his family, and his heir presumptive, Prince Charles, — his own marriage with Nicole had proved barren, — was now in the early prime of a youth that gave

promise of a splendid manhood. In such circumstances, even Charles might have felt that he owed a debt to his devoted subjects; that his chief care should be to retrieve their fortunes; that his insensate career should come to an end; and that he would best consult the interests of his House by adopting the son of the Princess Claude, and recognising his right to the succession. But he was one of those who, in the poet's words, 'see evil as good, and are led to destruction.' Improvident, reckless, and ostentatious, he preferred the gilded throngs which lackied the youthful state of Louis to the isolation of his palace at Nancy; and in vying with the Condés, the De Rohans, and the De Noailles, in the idle pomp of courtly luxury, he squandered treasures which might have redeemed his country. His restoration, as before, had been hailed with acclamations; but the aspect of his suffering people had no effect on his callous spirit, and he replied to their loyalty by edicts from Paris which ground them down with vexatious taxes, and by finally abolishing the franchises of his noblesse, in miserable imitation of the French monarch. A wasteful absentee, a heartless despot, a licentious fop, though his hair was now grey, he was content to barter the love of his people, his power as a sovereign, and the honour of his name, for the privileges of figuring in the ballets of Versailles, of kissing the hand of the Great King as one of the vassals of the crown, and of hearing from the frail beauties of the Fronde that time had not dimmed the grace of his mien or broken the majesty of his form. In the midst of this career, too, he showed the greatest jealousy of his brother and nephew, and did all in his power to thwart their fortunes. He intrigued to secure the succession of Lorraine to his bastards by Beatrix de Cusance; he crossed Prince Charles in two marriages which might have re-established his House; and he revived the old tale that the crown of Lorraine could not devolve in the female line. So far as he could, he defiled the lustre of his name by a series of low and reckless amours, which, even in the eyes of that generation, appeared discreditable in a man of sixty. At length, in a paroxysm of malice or folly, he yielded to the able and crafty De Lyonne, and signed away the rights of Prince Charles, by putting his hand to a solemn deed, which ceded to Louis the Fourteenth Lorraine and Bar in exchange for adoption into the House of Bourbon. Notwithstanding the prayers and protests of his nephew, he took this step in 1663; and although it did not lead, as the King had anticipated, to the immediate annexation of Lorraine to France, it was a link in the chain of events which accomplished that result.

Charles, ere long, was fated to reap the fruits of this new series of faults and follies. His waste and tyranny had irritated his people, and upon his abdicating they turned in part to his nephew, in part to the powerful sovereign of France, who had been very gracious to some of their nobility. The prodigality of the duke had left Lorraine in the state in which the Peace of the Pyrenees had found it,—without fortresses, sunk in poverty, and an easy prey to foreign invasion. His cruelty to his kinsman, who had fled to the court of Austria upon the signing of the deed of renunciation, had made his name a byword in Europe; yet it had only led to a rupture with Louis, who cheated him out of his part of the compact, and forsook his unhonoured old age. Having declared his last abdication void, the year 1667 again found him in Lorraine, at the head of a divided and alienated people, incapable of withstanding a single enemy, deserted by all with whom he had come in contact, and exposed to the ill-will of the imperious Louis. The French generals had recently fallen in full force upon the Spanish provinces of the Low Countries. As it was perilous to leave an armed neighbour upon his flank, Louis gave a peremptory order to Charles to send his whole force to the camp of Turenne, and to range it under the French standards. The duke remonstrated, but in vain; and, while his levies joined the powerful host which carried dismay to Ghent and Brussels, a Spanish army from Franche Comté made havoc of his hapless dominions. Soon afterwards, at the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, he was ordered to disband his troops; but he refused obedience, and hastily exclaimed that 'the Triple Alliance would prove a bridle on the 'House of Bourbon.' The only answer Louis vouchsafed was to send a party of dragoons to Nancy for the purpose of arresting the duke, and the entire province of Lorraine was soon again in the hands of the French armies. Charles, 'hunted 'like a hare,' as he bitterly said, hopeless, and driven to his last resources, hurried across the Rhine, made his way to Vienna, and offered his sword to the House of Austria. He was well received, for it was now apparent that war with the King of France was inevitable, and with the energy of hatred and despair he flung himself into the coalition which was being formed against the French monarch. In 1672, when the conflict began, he obtained a command in the Imperial armies, and, as usual, showed some conduct and skill in two campaigns against Turenne and Créqui. He died in 1675, leaving behind him a name which the chroniclers of his House should mark with almost unmixed reprobation. The ruin of a people and the fall of a proud name were the results of his career; and his

epitaph is written in the blood and tears which he caused to flow from too loyal a nation.

Every one remembers the noble scene in the Iliad, where Hector, leaving his wife and child, plunges into the thickest ranks of the fray, and restores the trembling fortunes of Priam. In the epic of the House of Lorraine, Prince Charles, afterwards Duke Charles the Fifth, fitly represents the ideal hero of sterling heart and mighty deeds, whose 'omen was to fight for his 'country.' He stands in history in luminous contrast to the rash and faithless Charles the Fourth; and it is somewhat remarkable that the Destroyer of Lorraine should have preceded immediately its Good Genius. Though inheriting nothing but his name and his sword, an exile, without a regiment or a crown, he rose to the summit of military fame, became a leader of kings and princes, shone in youth among grey-haired politicians in the noble art of advancing empire, and by his achievements, his wisdom, and his renown, not only redeemed his country from bondage, but was the remote cause of the high alliance which placed a Duke of Lorraine on the throne of Austria. Illustrious as were the great men of his race, he towers above them all in the lists of fame; and though he died before he had avenged on France the wrongs inflicted on his people, Louis the Fourteenth marked him out among the warriors and statesmen who planned the first coalition against him, as 'the greatest, the wisest, and the most generous of his ene-'mies.' Nor is his character less interesting that, in that dissolute age, he had a feeling and constant heart; and, as we pass from the tarnished life of his uncle, it is touching to observe the pious words with which, amidst the distractions of a camp, he tells his Eleanor, 'the hope and solace of his life, to kiss for 'him his young Leopold,' and in which, at the close of his proud career, he enjoins his imperial kinsman 'to guard a wife 'of your blood, a child who has nothing but his father's sword, 'and a people groaning under oppression.' 'Piety, and ancient 'faith, and the unconquerable arm,' these formed the glory of the Hope of Rome, and they graced, in strict historic truth, the second Octavius of the House of Lorraine.

The career of Charles the Fifth had a powerful influence upon the destiny of Lorraine, but that influence was not immediate, and his life was passed away from his country. After the attempt of his uncle to cancel his rights, he took refuge at the court of Austria, and carried his sword to the camp of Montecuculi, who was resisting the Turks with the forces of the Empire. At the great battle of Raab or Saint Gothard, in 1664, being then only twenty years old, he led a brilliant

charge on the right wing of the enemy, which mainly contributed to their defeat; was thanked by the commander-in-chief at the head of his staff; and having received a division of cavalry, distinguished himself highly in the campaign that followed. In 1668, supported by the interest of the Empire, and by a bright and growing reputation, he became a candidate for the throne of Poland: but his election was thwarted by Louis the Fourteenth, who had no wish that a Duke of Lorraine should rank among the greater sovereigns of Europe. The same influence crossed him again in 1673, when John Sobieski was his successful competitor; although, on this occasion, Leopold threw his whole weight into the scale, and his sister, Eleanor, widow of the late king of Poland, who loved Charles with fond affection, made great efforts to secure his election. In the meantime, he had achieved a high reputation in the long wars which the Hungarians, backed by Louis the Fourteenth, were waging against the House of Austria; and already, the Great King had heard at Versailles, from the lips of courtly but generous soldiers, that the Prince of Lorraine was one of those men who bade fair to rival Condé and Turenne. At the outbreak of the struggle of 1672, he served with distinction in its first campaigns; and having received the command of the Austrian cavalry in 1675, he showed much skill in the brilliant duel of strategy which was fought in that year between Turenne and Montecuculi. On the retirement of the latter commander, he was made generalissimo of the Imperial forces; and, in the course of the war, he overthrew Luxemburg in several encounters, and captured Philipsburg in the presence of a French army. He was defeated indeed by Créqui in 1677; but this reverse was not attributed to himself, and did not at all diminish his great reputation. In this year he was married to the faithful princess, who had loved him in all the vicissitudes of fate; and this marriage, blest beyond that of most royal couples, is still remembered by his descendants as the dawn of hope and promise to their House. In 1678, however, the fortunes of his own duchy, though rising with his fame, had not recovered their lamentable fall; and the treaty of Nimeguen left Lorraine in the occupation of the generals of Louis, and under the yoke of French despotism. At this juncture, Charles showed that ripe discretion which formed one of his principal characteristics. Louis had offered to restore the two duchies to him on terms incompatible with his independence; and the Confederates had assented to them without sufficient regard to the person interested. Charles, resolved not to accept a dishonoured crown, yet conscious of the impolicy of alienating his allies, declined to

become a party to the treaty on these conditions, but he cordially aided the progress of the negotiations, and took care to express his approval of the peace.

From 1678 to 1689, Charles was the foremost soldier and statesman of the Empire, and he raised the glory of the House of Lorraine to a height it had never before attained. As brother-in-law of the feeble Leopold, he held the highest rank in the Imperial House, and proved his title to that station in a series of triumphs in the cabinet and the field. M. D'Haussonville supplies an interesting account of his sagacious designs for the aggrandisement of Austria; and his principles, for more than a century and a half, formed the traditional policy of her greatest statesmen. Indeed, that remarkable document, his political testament, may be said to have been the basis of the Treaty of Utrecht, and of other important arrangements in Europe; and it may be added that, whenever its spirit has been abandoned, either by severity to Hungary, or concessions to Rome, the power and opulence of Austria have invariably declined. We cannot, however, enter into these details; nor can we follow Charles in the most splendid phases of his career, when, in concert with his old rival, John Sobieski, he scattered the Moslem hordes around Vienna, or when, while presenting to Leopold the standards of Hungary, which he had liberated from its secular oppressors, he warned the Emperor to conciliate that high-spirited nation by a policy of liberality and justice. In 1689 the energy of William the Third formed the second great coalition against France, and war was soon raging from the Irish Sea to the Adriatic and Mediterranean. As in former contests, the weightiest blows of the combatants were dealt along the Rhine and the Low Countries; and Charles of Lorraine, at the head of the armies of the Empire, was soon upon the great frontier river, and almost within sight of his old inheritance. It was just the time when the French troops had laid waste the Palatinate; and doubtless the aspect of that fearful scene made him remember, with bitterness and hate, what his House and his people had suffered from the same enemy. In the campaign of 1689, he took Mentz from D'Huxelles, and Bonn from De Hasfeldt; at length he had the delight of seeing the standards of France recoil before him across the Rhine. The Confederates fully appreciated these services: and the Diet of Ratisbon pledged the faith of the Empire to Charles, that his entire restoration to Lorraine should be a *sine quâ non* of any future peace. A great career was now opening before him; he had been triumphant in every engagement, and France lay open to his

attack; he had obtained a guarantee that his House would not be blotted out from among the sovereigns of Europe; and from across the Rhine, his people, arising from the long night of bondage, appealed to him loudly as their deliverer. But fate struck down his avenging sword; and he died in 1690, in the flower of his age, not without the admiration of generous foes, who respected his genius and his wisdom, and amidst the tears, not soon dried up, of his native and his adopted country.

On the death of Charles the Fifth, the title to Lorraine devolved upon his son Leopold, then only in his twelfth year. The youth was restored to his dominions at the Peace of Ryswick,—William the Third and several of the electors of the Empire having remained faithful to their engagements,—and in the winter of that year he made his entry into Nancy, borne thither, as it were, by his father's renown, amidst the shouts of a loyal people. One of his first public acts was to conciliate Louis, by rendering homage for the Duchy of Bar. Saint Simon, who particularly disliked the duke, describes this scene with malicious minuteness; and his account explains the repugnance of such a man as Charles the Fourth to the ceremony: —

'The king awaited M. de Lorraine in the drawing-room, which was then between the chamber and the closet which has since become the king's chamber. He sate in an arm-chair with his head covered; and behind him stood the princes his grandsons, the princes of the blood, the legitimised sons of Madame de Montespan, and the great officers of the crown, with the chancellor and the secretaries of state. At a little distance a semicircle was formed, in which several of the frequenters of the court had places. M. de Lorraine found the door of the drawing-room shut close, and the usher on the inner side. One of the suite of the duke knocked. "Who is there?" the usher asked; and when the answer came, "It is M. le Duc de Lorraine," the door remained as fast as ever. Some minutes passed and the solemnity was reiterated. At the third attempt the voice said, "It is M. le "Duc de Bar;" and the usher opened the door by a single panel. M. de Lorraine walked in and made several low bows, at the doorway first, next in the middle of the room, and then when he approached the presence. The king did not stir, and remained covered, without making the slightest sign of recognition. Upon this the Duke of Gesvres, accompanied by Nyert, but with his hat under his arm, stepped two or three paces in advance, and having taken from M. de Lorraine his sword, hat, and gloves, he handed them to Nyert, who stood a little in the rear. M. de Lorraine then knelt down on both knees, upon a piece of red velvet edged with gold, at the feet of the king; and the king took his hands and kept them shut within his own. This being done, the chancellor read aloud very distinctly the formula of homage and oath of fealty; and the Duke of Lorraine assented to them, and declared that they were correct in tenor. He

then rose, and, standing by the king's side, affixed his signature to the oath with a pen presented by Torcy. Hereupon Nyert gave him back his sword (which he sheathed at once), and his hat and gloves; and shortly afterwards he withdrew from the chamber. The ceremony being over, the king retired to the closet, and from thence sent a message to M. de Lorraine, who remained with him nearly half an hour.'

The career of Leopold was long, and fills some space in the history of Europe, but we can only refer to such parts of it as bore upon Lorraine and its destiny. Though without the splendid qualities of his father, this prince was a man of rare abilities, and he displayed remarkable wisdom and forethought in a position of considerable difficulty. The paramount object of his life was to promote the dignity of his family; and he pursued this aim with untiring energy in the various phases of his chequered fortunes. Having been brought up in exile at Innspruck and Vienna, he was not sufficiently patriotic to identify the interests of his House with those of his Duchy, and he was too penetrating not to perceive that he held his sovereignty by a precarious tenure at the will either of France or the Empire. Hence his whole policy was personal, not national: to secure for the descendants of his race a settled place among the Powers of Europe, not to withdraw Lorraine from the influence that had absorbed Franche Comté and Provence. Could he but raise his House to the level of established sovereigns, it was little to him that 'sacred Ilium was to fall,' and that Nancy was to know its dukes no more. This principle governed his entire conduct, and explains many of its seeming inconsistencies. Thus, although a German in taste and feeling, he married the sister of Philip of Orleans, in the hope that this marriage would gain for his House the support and interest of that of Bourbon. Though he loved his people, and was loved by them, he acceded to the Second Treaty of Partition; for if that treaty would have placed them under French domination, it would have assured the Milanese to his descendants. Though a remarkably cautious politician, and especially anxious to maintain neutrality in the War of the Succession, he lent his aid to the design of dismembering the French monarchy; for had this succeeded, the House of Lorraine would have become really sovereign and independent. So, too, he made every effort to marry his daughter to Louis the Fifteenth; and he impoverished his duchy and alienated his subjects to obtain for his son the hand of Maria Theresa. This policy, doubtless, was not dignified, but it was pursued with singular zeal and perseverance; and it must

be admitted that it was eminently successful. The palace at Nancy has long been a barrack; but a descendant of Leopold rules at Vienna, in virtue, in no slight degree, of the energetic self-seeking of his ancestor. And it is only within the present times that the representatives of the Dukes of Lorraine have forfeited, by their own fault, the easy and luxurious throne of Tuscany.

Leopold, however, did not neglect his duty in the government or the administration of his dominions. Indeed, these objects were only secondary to the great aim and end of his existence. When he arrived at Nancy in 1697, he found the old organisation of Lorraine broken up, the constitutional franchises of the people destroyed by the edicts of Charles the Fourth and the severities of Louis the Fourteenth, and the nation groaning in penury and despair under continued exactions and oppression. For nearly sixty years, with scarcely an interval, Lorraine had been in the hands of the House of Bourbon, and Richelieu, Mazarin, and Louvois had treated it as a subjugated province, in which it was politic to destroy the seeds of national life. Charles the Fourth had too ably seconded their efforts, and the result was that the levelling despotism of France had almost obliterated the institutions and characteristics of the duchy. No man living could recollect the last meeting of the States-General, and the images of the feudal monarchy, of the dominant seigneurie, and of the privileged tiers-état, had vanished from the general remembrance. The noblesse had either secluded themselves in their ruined castles, where they scarcely kept up a shadow of their state, or they had sworn allegiance to the Great King and filled the ranks of his soldiers and courtiers. The commons, though less forgetful of their national rights, had been kept down in forced submission, and under the pressure of foreign tribunals, of French marshals, and of French tax-gatherers, had gradually become broken in to servitude. Leopold did not attempt to raise the ancient constitution on this ruined basis of extinct feudalism. As might have been expected in such a state of things, he concentrated the powers of government in himself, and established absolutism in Lorraine; but absolutism tempered by sagacious foresight, and by a sincere regard for the welfare of his people. The principal aims of his government were, to secure the neutrality of Lorraine in any possible war between France and Germany, and to promote its internal opulence and prosperity; and, except when they interfered with this paramount object, he pursued these ends with the energy and wisdom which characterised all his public conduct. Even during

the tremendous War of the Succession, while the territories near the Rhine were annually swept by vast armies, he contrived to keep Lorraine comparatively intact; and, at last, towards the close of his life, he obtained from the courts of Vienna and Versailles a recognition of the perpetual neutrality of his dominions. In the meantime, during the whole of his reign, he did much to increase the welfare of his subjects, though more than once, in the supposed interests of his House, he did not scruple to impose heavy burdens upon them. Like all the sovereigns of the period, he gave the finishing blow to the lingering privileges of the aristocracy, and converted them into mere titled subjects; a change which was, perhaps, of service to his people. He revived the ruined commerce of Lorraine by attracting artificers and manufacturers to the duchy; and he encouraged its agricultural industry by a generally just and equal government. Long before his death he had the happiness of seeing the wasted solitudes through which he had passed in 1697, in the full bloom and wealth of culture, and of reading in the eyes of a flourishing people that they had forgotten the miseries of the past and were contented with their sovereign.

The fortunes of Lorraine were greatly influenced by this wise, thoughtful, yet somewhat selfish policy, which, steadily pursued for many years, slowly undermined the political independence of the duchy, though it promoted the national prosperity. Though liked by his nobles and popular with his subjects, it was felt that Leopold was not a national sovereign, and the loyalty of the people of Lorraine for their dukes began gradually to evaporate. The decline of this feeling became more evident after Leopold sent his son Francis to be brought up at Vienna, and when it was known that the youth was to fill an alien throne as the consort of an Austrian archduchess. The noblesse of Lorraine, shorn of their feudal rights, and merely satellites of the court at Nancy, had no longer any interest in the national existence, and they often turned a wistful eye to the luxury and splendour of Versailles. At the same time many of the commons, enriched by long prosperity, and rising rapidly in intelligence, could not help observing that Lorraine lay open to invasion; that its fortresses and defences were things of the past; and that their best hope of security was to become subjects of the House of Bourbon. These sentiments and interests concurred to break down the strong spirit of independence which once had breathed in Lorraine; and they were powerfully aided by the peculiar influences which marked the thought of the eighteenth century. Voltaire had already pro-

claimed to Europe that monarchy was tyranny under another name, and that the love of country was a superstition; and his teaching spreading in a thousand ways, had not been without effect upon the people of Lorraine. As a body, indeed, they still loved the reigning family, and would have spurned the idea of being annexed to France; but signs were not wanting that their loyalty and patriotism were declining, and that Fleury perhaps could achieve the result for which Richelieu and Mazarin had laboured in vain. When Leopold died in 1729, an acute observer might have foreseen that upon the first European convulsion, Lorraine would probably lose its independence, and would not retain enough of recuperative power to re-assert its separate existence.

Nor was the time for this consummation distant. Duke Francis, the son and successor of Leopold, an Austrian in feeling and education, and affianced to Maria Theresa, naturally thought more of Vienna and Schönbrunn than of the petty residences of Nancy or Luneville. He seldom visited his hereditary dominions, and, when there, displayed a cold and austere manner, a disregard for the noblesse of Lorraine, and a marked preference for his German household. This conduct made him unpopular, especially among the higher classes, and the feeling descended, with more or less force, to the different ranks of his subjects. The people of Lorraine became convinced that they were abandoned by their sovereign, and that destiny was preparing for them a change of masters. It is true that parties arose among them, one of which upheld the cause of the Duchess Dowager, while the other inclined to France or the Empire; but these parties had no real energy, and the prevailing temper of the nation was a calm though reluctant acquiescence in its prospects. In this state of things the occasion was not slow to arrive when the policy of Richelieu was to be accomplished, and Lorraine to be finally annexed to the French monarchy. At the close of the war of the Bavarian succession, it was agreed between the Houses of Hapsburg and Bourbon, that Lorraine should be ceded to Stanislas Leczinski for life, with remainder to the line of the French crown; that, as an equivalent, the duke should obtain the reversion of Tuscany, and that France should confirm the Pragmatic Sanction, which assured the throne of Austria to Maria Theresa. Duke Francis, with some show of reluctance, assented to terms which secured him an empress for a wife; and, notwithstanding the prayers and entreaties of his mother, who insisted on the claims of her second son, Charles, and of some of the aristocracy of Lorraine, who denied the

legality of the cession, he put his hand to the deed of annexation, and Lorraine became virtually a French province. The treaty was signed in February, 1737, and before a month had passed, the commissioners of Stanislaus had taken possession of the duchy. The duke, in the company of his young wife, and amidst the splendour of the imperial court, had already half forgotten the transfer; but it was otherwise with his mother and brother, and with the nation whose fate had thus been settled. No show of national opposition, indeed, was made; no patriotic armies were levied; no noble of Lorraine was found to raise the banner of Réné and of Charles the Fifth; and the people silently acquiesced in an event which had long been anticipated. But they felt the extinction of their independence with bitter regret; their loyalty and national spirit, though in decline, showed a bright spark of life at the last moment; Nancy and Luneville sate in mourning, and their inhabitants broke into sobs and tears when the representatives of their sovereigns passed away.

We transcribe M. D'Haussonville's remarks upon this event, the more interesting for their application to the annexation of other provinces, which has within the last few months transferred to France the ancient inheritance in Savoy and Nice of another House, not less illustrious than that of Lorraine.

'So far as regarded their private interests, the noblesse of Lorraine, and many among its official classes, were not blind to the advantage of becoming subjects of a greater master, and of living under the protection of a government more formidable to its neighbours. But even those who expected to gain by the change of sovereigns, did not the less grieve at the loss of the national existence. With them, as with the other classes of the people, the predominant feeling was patriotic sorrow, and the consciousness of a great public misfortune. With our present cast of thought and our modern ideas, it is perhaps not easy to comprehend the nature and the strength of the bonds which, in another age, connected a people with its princes. The sons of high-souled men, who were daring enough to break off completely from the dogmas of the past, our lullaby in infancy was the tale of the fall of the most illustrious monarchy in the world. In our schooldays we witnessed the extraordinary grandeur of an empire which, based solely upon force, believed itself eternal, yet was swept away in its turn. In youth, when our minds opened for the first time to the ideas of natural equity and justice, we saw the nominal champions of ancient right and tradition officially appropriate and dismember races like herds, and, within a single year of peace, trample a greater number of nations under foot, and put an end to more legitimate dynasties than revolution itself had dared to crush in twenty years of war. During manhood we have changed our government two or three times. So many catastrophes do not fall upon a

single generation without bringing their penalty with them. The great mass of mankind is too feeble to bear such an experiment. Worn out with the noble but exhausting passions of public life, many of us in these days think it an act of wisdom to proclaim indifference as their political faith.

From 1737 the history of Lorraine is really that of a French province. King Stanislas was merely a pensioner of Louis the Fifteenth, for before he obtained possession of the duchy he ceded his sovereign rights to the crown of France, retaining only an annuity as an equivalent. Within a year after the arrival of Stanislas at Nancy, Lorraine was placed finally under the law of France, and under the fiscal and military system of the old monarchy; and from this point we may take leave of the phantom ruler, though he held his idle state for nearly thirty years, and made himself a pleasant companion to Voltaire and Montesquieu. As regards the people of Lorraine at this period, they were at first discontented with the changes in their government, and they protested loudly at the despotic yoke, at the heavy taxes, and the harsh penal code which had suddenly been imposed upon them. Once, during the war of the Austrian succession, when the armies of Prince Charles had crossed the Rhine, and almost touched his ancient patrimony, they raised a cry for the national independence, and the slopes of the Vosges shone bright with fires that beckoned onward their hoped-for deliverer. Indeed, even down to the death of Stanislas, they had not become entirely reconciled to their new masters, and during his reign they occasionally displayed signs of disaffection and insubordination. But upon the whole they submitted quietly to a destiny which they felt was an accomplished fact, and they showed nothing of the strong patriotic feeling which had filled them in the preceding century. The nobles soon became completely French, and before a generation had passed away, the majority of the people were almost assimilated. At the Revolution of 1792 little difference could be found between the inhabitants of Lorraine and of Champagne; and the deputies of the Meurthe, the Meuse, and the Vosges, the departments into which the province had been divided, made no protest at the bar of the Convention in favour of the daughter of Duke Francis and Maria Theresa, though it was the blood of Lorraine that was shed on the scaffold of Marie Antoinette. So it was in the internecine struggle which followed. Whenever they approached the ancient duchy, the Austrian armies were encountered as the foes of France, and men, whose great grandfathers had bled under Charles the Fifth of Lorraine in many a fierce

engagement with Luxemburg, became generals of the Republic and marshals of Napoleon, and followed the tricolor with equal fidelity. Long before these days the fusion has been quite completed; the Zouaves and the Voltigeurs who are now encamped within the old abode of the Dukes of Lorraine, little think that the friendly populace around them were once the determined foes of Frenchmen. By these and similar changes the territory of France has gradually become what it now is; and by the same policy of annexation and assimilation, steadily pursued through successive ages, and under different governments, France still labours to extend her dominions at the expense of her neighbours.

ART. IV.—1. *Siluria; the History of the Oldest Fossiliferous Rocks and their Foundations, with a Brief Sketch of the Distribution of Gold over the Surface of the Earth.* By Sir RODERICK IMPEY MURCHISON. Third Edition (including *The Silurian System*). London: 1859.

2. *On the Geological Structure of the North of Scotland, &c. &c.* By Sir RODERICK I. MURCHISON, Director-General of the Geological Survey of the British Isles. (Transactions of the British Association 1855. Tr. Sect., p. 80.; Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society for 1858—1859.)

3. *New Geological Map of the Highlands* (Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society, May, 1860).

TWENTY-TWO years have elapsed since Sir Roderick Murchison, combining the results of observations carried on during the previous seven years in the region of England and Wales once occupied by the ancient British people the Silures, produced his large and important work, 'The Silurian System.' On a former occasion* we endeavoured to do justice to the labours that first unravelled the relations of various deposits more ancient than the Old Red Sandstone, and the Royal Society of London rewarded these successful researches by the Copley Medal. Geologists of other countries soon found that the Silurian classification was applicable to vast regions of Europe and America, and, assisted by M. Edouard de Verneuil and Count Keyserling, its author demonstrated that this

* Ed. Rev., vol. lxxiii. p. 1., with a Map of the Silurian Region.

ancient system of life, succeeded by other vast palæozoic formations, was spread over Russia in Europe, the Ural Mountains, and Scandinavia. Five years ago the fruits of these researches at home and abroad, extending also over America and Australia, were condensed into the smaller work called 'Siluria,' and last year produced the volume now before us, including the 'original Silurian System,' with some very important additions, to which we now propose briefly to advert.

One of the main objects of the geological labours of Sir Roderick Murchison has been to draw from the deep records of the earth the history of the primeval rocks, or rather of the earth itself; and to trace the slow growth and development of nature from the first sediment of mud, sand, and pebbles, cast by the accidents and revolutions of unfathomable ages over the fundamental ancient gneiss, which contains no vestiges of vegetable or animal life. 'Siluria' therefore treats chiefly of those early formations in which the first signs of life begin to occur,—formations obviously corresponding to a very long natural epoch in the structure of the globe and the production of its inhabitants. From these repositories of primeval marine creatures, traces of every group of purely aquatic animals have now been collected, save fishes; and it is highly characteristic of the rigorous lines of distinction which mark the order of creation, that throughout the Lower Silurian rocks no trace of a fish or any superior animal has ever been detected, though these rocks abound with infinite numbers of invertebrate creatures. The Lower Silurian was consequently an epoch when no example had appeared of that complete bony framework in which, as approaching to the vertebrate archetype, the comparative anatomist traces the first step in that series of creations which ended in man. So again, although the Silurian era presents the observer with countless proofs of sea-beaten shores, not a trace of land plants, any more than of fishes, can be discovered until we reach the uppermost beds of the system. After fishes had appeared, long ages elapsed before a reptile was added to the inhabitants of those epochs; and then, after a copious terrestrial vegetation had given birth to the carboniferous formations, and supported many varieties of insect life, no sign is to be met with of the existence of any mammalia. At length in the Tertiary formations we find on all sides the bones of the higher orders of mammalia drifted from the adjacent lands, and mixed with the exuviæ of marine creatures, gigantic quadrupeds which must have required for their sustenance, in the very regions we now inhabit, a range as extensive as that enjoyed by civilised man. Such is the broad outline of the

series in which the Silurian system, with its Cambrian and crystalline 'foundations,' occupies the base. We are told that the remains of the Silurian creatures are scattered through deposits reaching to nearly thirty thousand feet of perpendicular thickness; and it is evident that their gradual formation must have occupied a long period, perhaps the longest in the history of our planet. It therefore becomes a matter of high interest to trace the vestiges of this primeval world in the different parts of the globe in which they prominently occur. These observations have now been very considerably extended; and they are the more interesting to ourselves, as the latest discoveries submitted by Sir Roderick Murchison to the British Association at Aberdeen in 1859, (some of which are incorporated in the volume now before us,) are the result of a careful examination of the Northern Scottish Highlands.

In the British Isles, at the time when the preceding edition of 'Siluria' was published, the oldest known strata were found on the borders of Shropshire and North Wales, near the Menai Straits; rocks apparently of a similar age, and resulting from the same conditions, occur in Ireland in the county of Wicklow. More recently rocks of a still more ancient type, and having quite a different physical aspect, have been recognised by the author of 'Siluria' in the north-west extremity of Great Britain, resembling those which had already been observed in Canada, and described as the Laurentian rocks of the Canadian geologists. In the north-western extremities of Scotland rocks of a like character make their appearance, and under such aspects, as to establish the inference that the Scottish masses are the representatives of the Laurentians, both in position and age. These rocks of North Britain extend over a considerable area in the west of Sutherland and Ross-shire, forming the bold promontories on the west and north-west of the latter county, and occupying the greater portion of the large island of Lewis. Like their Canadian representatives, they consist of gneiss; and in order to distinguish them from other gneissose rocks of the north of Scotland, Sir Roderick Murchison has designated them '*fundamental gneiss*.' This primeval gneiss, which in the western part of Sutherland exhibits itself in rugged bossy masses, like the broken waves of an agitated sea, has somewhat of a granitoid aspect, being composed of felspar, hornblende, and quartz. The lines of its stratification are in a direction nearly at right angles to the prevailing strike of the rocks which cover it; and it also presents innumerable contortions, which in no way affect the overlying masses. This fundamental gneiss of the north of Scotland is the oldest mass

in the British Isles, and few countries (certainly not England, Wales, and Ireland, according to our author), contain rocks of such high antiquity.

To appreciate fully the difficulties attendant on the investigation of the north-west of Scotland, it is necessary to know something of its contour. A country covered with lofty mountains more picturesque and steep than any which are met with in other areas of Scotland; features rugged and grand, and offering great impediments even to physical exertion, are the characteristics of this region. A vast extent of moor devoid of population, the haunt of the red-deer and snowy ptarmigan, covered with numerous fresh-water lakes, and intersected by many arms of the sea which make great inroads into the interior, is a district in some respects favourable to scientific research; but bogs and morasses mask much of the surface, and the climate is, perhaps, the most rude and severe of any part of the British Isles. When, however, the storms and tempests have ceased, and when the sun smiles upon this land, scenes which are grandly beautiful everywhere present themselves. The blue lake of Assynt, reflecting with greater intensity the azure sky, the brown heath-clad mountains scored with glens or indented with corries, fringed with the foliage of the Alpine birch, or gilded with the frost-touched bracken, combine to form features of solemn beauty; and the dark mountains which mantle round Glencoul and Glendhu, as seen from Kyle-Strome, give to these spots an aspect of wildness which is unsurpassed in broad Scotland.

Sir Roderick's observations in this region show that the ancient gneiss is, in many localities, covered by strata which are devoid of the metamorphic nature exhibited by the rock beneath them. These covering strata, which consist of purple grits made up of fragments varying in size from a marble to grains of sand, are well seen in the rugged mountains which give to the north-west of Scotland its peculiar features. These purple grits form the great mass of Queenaig, Canisp, Suilvein, Coulmore, and Coulbeg, and they are exhibited here and there over other parts of the western portions of Sutherland and Ross. The constituents of them have been obtained from the older gneiss, on the eroded surfaces of which they repose; and these overlying grits have a maximum thickness of from 2000 to 2500 feet. Their strata are arranged in a nearly horizontal position, and this approximation to the horizontal line is well seen in the escarpments which form the southern side of Queenaig. These purple or Cambrian grits of Sutherland have hitherto afforded no traces of organic life among their contents; their position, and the rela-

tion which they bear to the subsequently formed strata, place them on a parallel with the Cambrian group, or the Huronian deposits which occur in North America, and, like these Sutherland purple beds, rest on the fundamental gneiss of that country. In allusion to the equivalent of these deposits in North America, our author observes: —

'Like the venerable Scottish gneiss, it is also unconformably surmounted by hard sandstones, conglomerates, and schists (with some chert and limestone), which attaining the vertical dimensions of about 12,000 feet on the north shore of Lake Huron, have been termed "Huronian." This Huronian group or system, which has been paralleled by Logan with the Cambrians, or Longmynd Rocks of Britain, is again covered transgressively (as in our own north-western highlands) by the lowest of the fossiliferous bands of the Lower Silurian, or the Potsdam sandstone.' (*Siluria*, p. 456.)

The important reforms which have been recently made in the geology of the north-west of Scotland by the author of 'Siluria' extend upwards in the geological series, far beyond the positions which have been assigned to the fundamental gneiss and the Cambrian grits of Ross-shire and Sutherland. Above these are other deposits, which his industry has also unravelled. The purple grits of this area have been referred to as occupying a nearly horizontal position. On their eastern flanks, thick masses of white and yellowish quartz-rock are found, as may be seen in the frontispiece to the present volume, which represents one of these patches of inclined quartz-rock on the top of the remarkable mountain of Queenaig in Sutherland.

These quartz-rocks, reposing unconformably on the purple Cambrians of the north-west of Scotland, afford the earliest evidence of organic life in the Highlands. This evidence occurs in the form of worm burrows, having a direction nearly perpendicular to the planes of the strata. The Potsdam sandstones of North America contain similar perforations; and here again an intimate relation is shown between deposits of the same age in far removed countries. The Stiper Stones of Shropshire, deposits of the same age, also furnish similar evidence of former life.

In the north-west of Scotland other strata occur reposing on these quartz-rocks, which contain the earliest traces of life. The overlying strata, agreeing in their inclination with the quartz-rocks, consist of limestones, which in Assynt form 'noble 'terraces' on the east side of the lake. They occur not only largely in Assynt, they make their appearance likewise in great profusion on the east side of Durness Loch; and are also seen occupying the same position on the shores of Loch Eriboll. In Assynt they were formerly worked for marble. At Dur-

ness they possess a highly siliceous nature, containing singular nodules of chert, and small angular pinkish-coloured masses of the same substance, which give to the limestone of Durness a peculiarly mottled aspect. These limestones were long regarded as appertaining to the great primary series, so amply developed over a great portion of the west and north of Scotland, and they were looked upon as devoid of fossils. In Assynt and at Eriboll, this is to a great extent the case; but at Durness, owing to the keen powers of observation possessed by Mr. Peach, so well known for his marine researches, and as the first geologist who recognised fossils in the Silurian rocks of Cornwall, these limestones have been found to possess a characteristic fauna. This fauna, which has been examined and described by Mr. Salter, has a great affinity to that of the calciferous sand rock of North America, a series of deposits resting upon the Potsdam sandstone of the western continent. For here we have fossils (such as *Maclurea*, *Ophileta*, *Orthoceras*, *Murchisonia*, with small *Orthidæ*, &c.,) which correlate the limestones of Assynt, Durness, and Eriboll with one of the lower members of the Silurian group as it occurs in the New World. The fossils from the Durness limestones have a much greater affinity to the American forms of this period than to those of an equivalent age in Europe, and are to a great extent similar to those described by Mr. James Hall in his excellent work on the Palæontology of the State of New York.

To the limestones, which are far from uniform in thickness, succeeds another series of altered sandstones or quartz-rocks, possessing features which show that they have been formed from the same materials which constitute the inferior strata. These upper quartz rocks in some instances attain to great thickness. They crown one of the loftiest mountains of the north-west of Scotland, Ben More of Assynt, rising 3235 feet above the sea level. This ridge, extending northwards, gives rise to other rugged masses which lie east of Glencoul and Glendhu, and which cast their morning shadows over scenes as grand and wild as any which Scotland affords. The fossil contents of these upper quartz-rocks are similar to those of their inferior representatives; at Eriboll they have afforded an Orthoceratite. In their higher portions thin masses of limestone occur, but these are far from being persistent.

The discovery by Sir Roderick Murchison of two distinct gneissic masses in the north of Scotland has placed the geology of this area in a totally different light from that which prevailed anterior to his observations in this region, and suggests a sweeping change in geological maps; as is seen in the new map of

the north of Scotland which he has just issued. (Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc. vol. xv. pl. 12.) In Sutherland and Ross, this newer gneiss with micaceous schists, &c., distinctly repose upon, and is therefore younger than, the fossiliferous zone of quartz-rocks and limestone. Ranging over wide spaces, the author supposes that its area will be found to extend largely southwards, and that it may include all, or nearly all, the crystalline stratified rocks of Inverness, Moray, Banff, Aberdeen, Perth, and Argyle. The new light which has thus been thrown on the history of the geological series of Scotland, showing that great masses of crystalline rocks, called primary and supposed to be much more ancient than the Silurian System, are here simply metamorphosed strata of that age, may with justice be looked upon as one of the most valuable results which has been attained by British geologists for many years. It was more especially on this ground that the Royal Society of Edinburgh deemed it proper to award to the founder of the Silurian System the first Brisbane medal, with an address, expressing their interest in and admiration for his recent researches in the Highlands of Sutherland.

Besides the important recognition of the age of the strata in the north-west of Scotland, already alluded to, within the last five years other matters of great moment have been added to the Silurian geology of this country. That pastoral area extending from the German Ocean to the Irish Sea, to which the term the Southern Highlands is applied, was already known, through the researches of Professor Nicol, to belong to the Silurian age, but the Upper Silurian is, on the whole, but imperfectly exhibited in Scotland. Fossils of this age have, however, been recently obtained from the Pentland Hills by Mr. Geikie and the officers of the Geological Survey, and these fossils indicate the Ludlow Rocks. There is another locality in this country that affords Upper Silurian remains which have not only a great affinity to the contents of the highest portion of this system, but which, in this locality, have also been met with in greater abundance and perfection than in any other part of the British Isles. The tract from whence these fossils have been obtained lies among the elevated districts which occur west of Lesmahago, separating the counties of Ayr and Lanark. There, dark schistose rocks contain crustaceans allied to Eurypterus, — forms which characterise the highest Silurian zone; and fossil shells, the types of the highest Silurian beds, are associated with these crustaceans. Besides the forms of crustaceans just referred to, these deposits, near Lesmahago, contain another form of a shrimp-like animal, the *Ceratiocaris*, the

remains of which have likewise been procured from the same platform both in Shropshire and Westmoreland. Concerning the diffusion and position of these crustaceans the author observes: —

'In Southern Russia (Podolia) similar large crustaceans, analogous to Pterygoti, were found in strata lying beneath rocks which are known to be of Devonian age, and to one of these Dr. Fischer gave the name of *Eurypterus tetragonophthalmus*. Recently M. Eichwald has detected several species, one of which he figures as *Eurypterus remipes*, Dekay, in the Isle of Oesel in the Baltic, *i.e.* in a limestone which my colleagues and myself referred to the highest Silurian stage, and which Professor Schmidt, of Dörpat, has shown by many of its fossils to be the exact equivalent of the Upper Ludlow rock. In the north, therefore, as in the south of Russia, the zone under consideration, when clearly expressed, is everywhere characterised by large and peculiar crustacea, no one of which has ever been found in the Lower Silurian rock.

'In North America it has long been known, from the writings of Dekay and Harlan, that large Eurypteri occur in a so-called black greywacke slate at Westmoreland, in Oneida county, New York, which will probably be found to be in the parallel of the Upper Ludlow rock: and even in Canada, as we learn from the collections of Sir W. E. Logan, species of Eurypterus and Pterygotus occur. The discovery of the large Eurypteridæ in the same geological zone in other distant regions, is therefore peculiarly satisfactory.

'Wherever these large crustaceans are found, and with them the small Lingulæ and spiral shells, we may be sure that we are at or near the very summit of all rocks to which the term Silurian can be applied, and that the next overlying stratum belongs to the great era of fishes, the Devonian or Old Red Sandstone; for the thin transition band now under consideration still remains what I stated it to be twenty-one years ago.' (*Siluria*, p. 178.)

We remember when these fossils from Lesmahago were first exhibited before the geological section of the British Association at Glasgow, some geologists were disposed to regard them as coming from the representatives of a portion of the Devonians, the Forfarshire flags. On this occasion Sir Roderick maintained their Silurian age, and all the circumstances which have since been found attendant on the strata producing them, as well as his subsequent description of this tract *, have fully corroborated that conclusion.

In the sister isle, rocks belonging to the Silurian age are developed in several areas. They have been recognised by General Portlock in Tyrone and Fermanagh, and by Sir Richard Griffith in the south and west of Ireland. Subse-

* Quart. Journal, Geol. Soc., vol. xii. p. 17.

quently they have been made the subjects of research by the officers of the Geological Survey; and Sir Roderick has himself more than once examined their relations in this country. The oldest sedimentary rocks of Ireland consist of purple slaty masses and quartzites, which are well seen at Bray Head, county Wicklow, and at Howth. These contain the peculiar fossil *Oldhamia*, and worm tracks, and represent the Longmynd, or Cambrian rocks, at the base of the Silurian system. To these succeed, unconformably, the altered rocks composing the great mass of the Wicklow mountains, having a granitic axis. In Wexford unaltered Silurians occur, from which are obtained fossils possessing the characters of Caradoc, and rarely of Llandeilo species. In Waterford and Kildare fossils of the same age occur. In the headlands of Kerry, between the bays of Dingle and Tralee, the rocks, which are greatly contorted, afford in some spots Upper Silurian fossils.

'In Connemara and the adjoining tracts, and thence extending to Uggool, in Mayo, the intermediate group of Llandovery rocks is strikingly apparent, though in fragments and patches only.' (*Siluria*, p. 192.)

The following passage conveys in a concise form some idea of the great vertical extent of these Silurian deposits.

'My originally described Lower Silurian strata of Shropshire to the west of the Longmynds, from the Stiper-stones upwards, including the Llandeilo formation, exhibit a thickness of 14,000 feet; and if we add to this mass the thickness of the Caradoc sandstones, limestones, and shales lying on the eastern slopes of Caer Caradoc, which have been described at p. 70. and amount to about 4000 feet, we ascertain that in the typical tract of Shropshire alone the Lower Silurian rocks attain dimensions of 18,000 feet. These dimensions are indeed nearly equal to those which have been estimated for their equivalents in the lofty, slaty, and rugged region between the Menai Straits and the Berwyn Mountains, where the surveyors have estimated the total thickness of all the strata of like age at 19,000 feet.

'In the lower part of these enormous accumulations of sedimentary strata, the rarest traces only of fossils have been found; and in the Lingula flags, the lowest of the Silurian zones, organic remains increase so slightly that comparatively few forms have yet been detected in them. In the great Llandeilo and Caradoc formations, however, the trilobites, molluscs, and corals augment enormously, and amount to many hundred species.

'The Llandovery rocks, intermediate between the lower and upper divisions, swell out in some parts of Wales to a thickness of 2000 or 3000 feet; and, though in many tracts this zone is of small dimensions, it is not poor in the variety of fossil species.

'The Upper Silurians, consisting of Wenlock and Ludlow rocks, attain nowhere a greater thickness than 5000 to 6000 feet; and yet

this younger group is as replete with fossils as the Lower Silurian strata, the dimensions of which are so much larger.

'In conclusion, it is, indeed, well to reflect upon the fact that, notwithstanding their enormous physical development of not less than 26,000 or 27,000 feet, the British Silurian rocks are not more copiously charged with organic remains than the strata of the same age in Scandinavia, where the total thickness of the Lower and Upper Silurians added together in one physical mass, does not exceed 2000 feet.' (*Siluria*, pp. 194, 195.)

This enormous mass of Silurian strata, as it occurs in the British Isles, has in many places been broken up by violent igneous outbursts. The deposits composing it have since their original deposition been also subjected to great flexures and contortions. Stupendous faults have separated great masses which were originally in the same planes; and in many instances the particles of the rocks have undergone such re-arrangement and changes as to lose their original aspect. All these features have combined to produce difficulties which the labours, the energy, the patience of the author of 'Siluria,' and of his followers, Professor Ramsay and the Geological Surveyors, have enabled him to overcome, by placing before geologists in perfect arrangement a series of rocks far exceeding in thickness any other of the geological formations.*

We should convey a very inadequate idea of the labours of Sir Roderick Murchison were we to confine our observations to the Silurian portion only of the great palæozoic group. The succeeding member, the Devonian group, bears almost an equal impress of his labours. The Devonian rocks, in their typical area, have been classified by this geologist, in conjunction with Canon Sedgwick. On the margins where this formation flanks the

* We have already had occasion in a former article in the present number to refer to Sir R. Murchison's predictions of the gold deposits in Australia, which he derived from his previous observations of the geological position and age of the gold veins in the Ural Mountains. First he showed, that, however recent might be the detritus in which gold was found (associated as fragments of the ore are with bones of mammoths, &c.), such detritus had invariably been derived from veinstones found in old slaty rocks of Silurian age. Next, comparing his Uralian rocks of this character with the specimens brought home by Count Strzelecki, Sir Roderick was the first to publish that our great Australian colonies would prove auriferous. It is now well established that in Australia, as in Russia, and indeed in all known auriferous tracts of Europe and America, the original site of the chief masses of gold is in the Silurian rocks, or in the igneous rocks associated with them, which is precisely what Sir R. Murchison first suggested.

Silurian strata of Wales, Shropshire, Herefordshire, &c., the deposits of this period have been particularly subjected to the investigations of Murchison, and the sequence of the strata intervening between the Silurians below and the carboniferous above, has thereby assumed that definite arrangement which enables geologists to recognise the several members of this formation in the areas where they make their appearance.

In Scotland great additions have been made to the Devonian series since the first edition of 'Siluria' appeared. The labours of the late Hugh Miller, combined with his fervid eloquence, have given to the Old Red Sandstone of Scotland — the equivalent (according to Sedgwick and Murchison) of the Devonian rocks of the south-west of England,—a higher degree of popular interest than has been assigned to most of the rocks which compose the other members of the sedimentary deposits. The areas exhibiting these Old Red Sandstones in Scotland are, for the most part, far removed from each other, and the several members of this formation have varied lithological aspects in different localities. These two circumstances combined to produce opinions in the correlation of the strata of this age in Scotland, at variance with what might be expected from geological deductions; and these errors were still further increased by the fossils which in different areas frequently bore little relation to each other, the organic remains of Caithness and the districts which border on the Moray Firth, being quite distinct from those obtained from the areas which lie south of the Grampians. In Caithness the deposits constituting the Old Red Sandstone consist at their base of conglomerates, the products of an agitated sea; but these in their higher beds possess the nature and characters of sandstones. Upon this lowest member of the tripartite series the dark flaggy beds of Caithness occur, yielding abundant organic remains in the form of fishes; and above the middle member, strata of red sandstones, with lighter coloured beds, are found, in which no organic remains are apparent. In Cromarty and the district of Moray the deposits appertaining to the Old Red exhibit the same aspect and relation, but in these areas the middle member has a comparatively small development, and consists of marlstones with nodules, the latter containing the same forms of fishes which the Caithness flags afford. These strata of the north of Scotland were recognised as the equivalents of the English Old Red Sandstone so far back as 1827 by Sir Roderick Murchison and his companion Professor Sedgwick.

One of the leading objects of Sir R. Murchison's latest researches has been to show, that the lower zone of the Old Red

Sandstone of the south of Scotland and the north-west of England, which is characterised by fossil fishes of the genus *Cephalaspis*, is fully represented in point of time by the great lower sandstones and conglomerates of Caithness and Ross, which underlie the Caithness and Orcadian flagstones. This inference is still further supported by the circumstance that in Herefordshire, and in other districts along the eastern margin of the Upper Silurians, the highest beds of the latter pass conformably upwards (through the tile-stones) to deposits yielding the same crustaceans and fishes (*Pterygotus* and *Cephalaspis*) which are found in Scotland. The evidence, therefore, is conclusive that here the lowest members of the Old Red are represented by the Forfarshire flags. The flaggy strata of Forfarshire have afforded few or no fossil fishes identical with those obtained in Caithness; there are, however, in some beds of this series indications of an approximation to the Caithness forms. In the neighbourhood of Montrose, Acanthodian fishes, a family which is very abundant in the Caithness flags, have very recently been found by the Rev. Mr. Mitchell in the grey shales of the Forfarshire flags, and this circumstance may help to connect the two members of the Old Red Sandstone of Scotland. In Caithness and Ross-shire, owing to the peculiar physical conditions which obtained during the deposition of the oldest member in this area, the conglomerate base contains no fossils. The succeeding portion, the Caithness flags, furnishes abundant traces of life both of animal and fossil vegetable nature. A profusion of fishes are amongst these remains, of families such as characterise the Old Red Sandstone in Russia and other regions.

Few districts have yet been recognised where the sequence of deposits is perfect from the Upper Silurian to the top of the Devonian group. In many localities the lower member of the latter is altogether absent. This is the case in Russia, where the Devonians are transgressive upon the Silurians. In this vast region the Devonian fishes seem to appertain to the middle and upper members of the group. Of thirteen genera twelve are common to this country and Scotland; 'whilst of the 'thirty species of these genera no less than eighteen are ab-'solutely identical with our south and north Scottish types.' In Russia these Old Red fishes are found in the very strata which contain marine shells such as occur in Devonshire, the Boulonnais and the Rhenish provinces; and this important fact, resulting from the extensive researches of Murchison and his associates, establishes the synchronism of this formation in Russia and Scotland, as well as in other parts of Europe.

The fossil flora of the lower and middle members of the Old

Red Sandstone is to a great extent as distinct as the fossil fauna. The traces of vegetation occurring in the Forfarshire flags are by no means so perfect as those which are found among the Caithness series. In the former, fragments having a woody aspect are seen, and with these are associated linear leaf-like bodies which have a considerable resemblance to the foliage of Lycopodium. In the Caithness flags coniferous wood and branching portions of plants of very distinct forms make their appearance. In these flags, too, there has long been known to exist a fossil having the aspect of a bivalve shell. It, however, has no relation to the Mollusca, but belonged to a crustacean, and has received from Mr. Rupert Jones the appellation of *Estheria Murchisoni.* In the whole of the strata which compose the Old Red Sandstone of Scotland, no trace of a mollusc has yet been met with; while in the equivalents of this formation in the south-west of England, and in several localities on the continent of Europe in some of the strata, shells occur in great profusion.

The Orkney and Shetland Isles afford deposits of the Old Red Sandstone age. Here the Caithness flags and the upper members of this formation are largely seen. Their features and the relations which they bear to other rocks in these islands have been amply described by the author in one of his memoirs on the geological structure of the north of Scotland.

Some of the deposits supposed to belong to the higher members of this formation, have of late attracted considerable attention among geologists. Little more than two years ago remains of a high organisation were found at Lossiemouth, where sandstones of a light colour are wrought; and from strata of a similar age near Elgin, Mr. Patrick Duff long ago procured the reptilian remains known as the *Telerpeton Elginense.* This small reptile was for some time looked upon as the earliest evidence which we possessed of an air-breathing lizard. The next indication of reptiles in the Lossiemouth sandstones was the discovery by Sir Roderick Murchison and Mr. G. Gordon of a large bone; and this bone, along with other more perfect remains since obtained from these beds, has, by the ingenuity of Professor Huxley, furnished us with an idea of its owner, in the form of a crocodilian reptile covered with bony armour, and having dimensions of from sixteen to eighteen feet in length. Owing to the labour and exertions of Mr. Gordon, another reptile has recently been added to the fauna of what appeared to be the highest member of the Old Red Sandstone. In a note appended to Sir Roderick's memoir, Professor Huxley notices this creature, to which he has given the name of

Hyperodapedon Gordoni; its generic title indicating the pavement-like arrangement of the teeth in the palate. The nearest representative of this reptilian product of the Lossiemouth sandstone is a fossil from the triassic strata in the neighbourhood of Shrewsbury, known from the characters of its jaws as the Rhynchosaurus. Whatever may be the nature of the palæontological evidences which the sandstones north of Elgin afford, there is no doubt that the arenaceous strata closely contiguous to this town bear proof, in their fossil contents, of belonging to the later portion of the Old Red series. Thus strata yielding fossil fishes of this age (*Holoptychius*) occur in such positions as to appear portions of the same group which contains the reptilian remains; the fish-bearing and reptiliferous strata being conformable and having a great lithological affinity to each other.*

The next member of the Palæozoic division, the carboniferous system, having been fully described by many geologists, the author of 'Siluria' has devoted to this series only such observations as serve to connect it with the other deposits of this great division. To the succeeding or supra-carboniferous group which constitutes the highest portion of the Palæozoic series, the Permian, he makes more special reference; and to this series of sedimentary rocks his labours, both in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe, have added matter of a most important character. The British rocks which compose the highest portion of the Palæozoic division were first described by Professor Sedgwick, in his celebrated memoir on the magnesian limestones and their associated strata in the north of England. These deposits occupy in the British Isles comparatively small areas when contrasted with their development on the Continent. In the south-eastern parts of Russia in Europe, they extend over a district of country twice the size of the kingdom of France, and from this vast area, embracing the ancient kingdom of Permia, they have received their present appellation. They run along the western flanks of the Ural Mountains in a north and south direction for about 700 miles, and their eastern and western course amounts to about 400 miles. In Germany they have been re-examined by Sir Roderick since

* In his last communication to the Geological Society, Sir R. Murchison, influenced by the palæontological evidence, has left this question in doubt, and in his new geological map has attached two marks of interrogation to the patch of country occupied by the Reptiliferous Sandstones. In fact, the surface of the rocks is so obscured by drift that no positive inferences have yet been arrived at.

the appearance of the first edition of 'Silúria,' and here their nature and the space which they occupy place them only second to the deposits of this age in Russia. In the British Isles, recent observations have shown, that in many localities they flank the borders of the coal measures to a considerable extent; and in their mineral nature they possess a varied aspect according to geographical position. These different strata, as well as some overlying strata, evidently required a collective name, and hence the 'Permian' of Murchison has been generally adopted. On leaving the typical Permian area of the north-east of England, and on approaching the margins of the South Staffordshire coal-field, deposits of the same age occur under different circumstances.

Compared with other deposits comprising the Palæozoic division, the Permians as represented in Scotland have only a small area. They are here devoid of their calcareous portion, and consist exclusively of sandstones. The red sandstones impressed with fossil footprints occurring in the south of Scotland were first referred to the Permian formation by our author; and, as relates to other localities in this country, he remarks,—

'It is also with good reason believed that much of the red rock which overlies the coal of Ayrshire is of Permian age, as well as those red sandstones in the southern part of the Isle of Arran, which Sedgwick and myself classed as New Red Sandstone, at a period when the Permian classification was unknown.' (*Siluria*, p. 351.)

Since the publication of 'Russia in Europe and the Ural 'Mountains,' the strata in Germany which compose the Permian formation have, on several occasions, received renewed examination. Of this country our author remarks, that there is no area where we have the base of the uppermost member of the palæozoic group 'more obviously separated from all underlying 'and overlying strata than in the tracts which flank the Thürin-'gerwald.'

In Germany an ample development of Permian strata surrounds the chain of the Harz. The deposits there possess many of the characters which are so common to this formation in other areas. The arenaceous base, the Rothliegende, manifests the usual irregularity in thickness, 'extremely 'thick in some places, and very thin, and even dying out, in 'others.' One circumstance, in connexion with the Permian strata surrounding the Harz, is of considerable interest — the local development of large masses of gypsum. There are also areas in the British Isles where rocks of a gypseous nature are associated with deposits of a Permian age. St. Bee's Head,

near Whitehaven, presents such an association; for here, lying upon magnesian limestone, characterised by Permian fossils, lenticular masses of gypsum are intercalated among red clays, forming the highest members of the group in this locality. This development of sulphate of lime in England is small when compared with the occurrence of the same rock in connexion with the Harz. The enormous masses of gypsum which are seen on the flanks of the Harz, are regarded by Murchison as the result of changes which have affected ordinary calcareous rocks subsequent to their deposition.

The extensive development of the Permians in their typical area in Russia has been already alluded to. Here they have been made the subjects of investigation by Murchison and his associates De Verneuil and Von Keyserling. The area in Russia in Europe containing strata of this age is larger than that occupied by any other of the palæozoic formations. Previous to those labours in Russia, the deposits which are now recognised as Permian were referred by some geologists to the carboniferous and by others to the triassic formations. Speaking of these strata our author observes: —

'To arrive at a sound conclusion respecting the age of these rocks, it became essential to traverse, as far as possible, the countries over which they extend, and compare the phenomena which led to such contradictory opinions. The result has been, that though these deposits are of a very varied mineral aspect, and consist of grits, sandstones, marls, conglomerates, and limestones, sometimes enclosing great masses of gypsum and rock salt, and are also much impregnated with copper and occasionally with sulphur; *yet the whole group is characterised by one type only of animal and vegetable life.*' (*Russia in Europe*, p. 138.)

Our scientific readers will be glad to follow or to accompany Sir R. Murchison himself in detail through the labyrinths which he has so ably explored. There is something oppressive and bewildering in the unfathomable depths and innumerable ages of geologic time; but Sir Roderick has done more than most geological writers to reduce his favourite science to an intelligible system, and the concluding chapter of the present volume presents us, in a pleasing and interesting form, with his general view. That view consists in the regular progression of life from the earliest appearance of invertebrate animals in the Silurian deposits up to the fulness of creation, which has produced a being capable of comprehending, in some degree, the divine scheme of the world. The succession of life from the lower to the higher forms of existence is the grand principle which he traces in all the geological records of nature;

but in a very different sense from that which has recently been brought forward by Mr. Darwin. Sir R. Murchison finds in the great geological periods which he has described, the clearest evidence, not of an unbroken series of spontaneous development by a process of 'natural selection or otherwise,' but of distinct species, called successively into existence and adapted to the existing conditions of the globe. Mr. Darwin has complained that what he terms the geological record is incomplete. Incomplete, for his purpose, it certainly is: but not deficient in evidence of a positive character in direct opposition to the opinions he has propounded. Of this, indeed, we require no better proof than is afforded by the data laid before us in 'Siluria,' (pp. 346. 513.), which show, that, with a perfect conformity of arrangement and a gradual and unbroken transition from the Permian strata into the overlying Trias, the forms of life in the one deposit are entirely distinct from those of the other, and do not exhibit a trace of intermediate links. The total absence of such links throughout the whole geological series,—links which ought to be found if the theory of Mr. Darwin were tenable, is the strongest argument which can be offered against its adoption.

If there be any branch of physical science of which Great Britain has occasion to be proud, it is that of Geology. For her sons have not only given to this science a nomenclature which has been generally adopted by the scientific world, but have also furnished a large portion of its data, and have widely extended its principles. The works of William Smith, the father of English Geology, of Murchison in the field and in the closet, the labours and eloquence of Sedgwick, and the philosophical deductions of Lyell, combined with the services which have been rendered to this branch of knowledge by many other British geologists, entitle us to look upon this science with a truly national interest; and the latest discoveries of our accomplished countrymen, in these islands and in other countries, demonstrate that this vast and instructive field of research is by no means exhausted.

ART. V. — 1. *Note Circulaire adressée par le Gouvernement des Romagnes à ses agents à l'étranger.* Boulogne: 1859.

2. *The Court of Rome and the Gospel.* Translated from the Italian of the Marquis ROBERTO D'AZEGLIO, with a Preface by A. H. LAYARD, D.C.L. London: 1859.

3. *Le Pape et le Congrès.* Paris: 1859.

4. *La Papauté et l'Empire.* Par F. LAURENT. Paris et Londres: 1860.

5. *Rome: its Rulers and its Institutions.* By JOHN FRANCIS MAGUIRE, M.P. Second Edition. London: 1859.

6. *La Question Romaine.* Par EDMUND ABOUT. Paris: 1859.

IT will be recorded hereafter, amongst the strangest incidents of an age pregnant with momentous changes in the state of Europe, that in the middle of the nineteenth century, and at the very time when the people of Italy seem to have entered upon their lost inheritance of freedom and independence, an appeal was made by the Roman pontiff to the chivalry of France and of the Catholic world,— that this appeal was answered by an accomplished general, who had served with high renown under the tricolor flag, and who only quitted the ranks of the French army because the liberty of his country was even dearer to him than her arms, — that in this singular enterprise no man could distinguish how much belongs to military ambition or how much to religious zeal, — that a band of mercenaries and of volunteers flocked to the standard of this chief from the banks of the Danube and of the Shannon, from the mountains of Switzerland and of the Tyrol, whilst Italy arrayed herself in arms against them, and another band of free lances, under a chief of equal renown, undertook and achieved the emancipation of Sicily, — that men who in other times had fought with ardour and perseverance the battle of civil and religious liberty against clerical authority, are now foremost in defending what they call the rights of the Papacy, — that in proportion as these rights are assailed and shaken in Italy they meet with new and unexpected champions in the other Catholic States of Europe, — that even an edict of taxation has gone forth from the altar, and the treasury of St. Peter is once more replenished by the pence of the faithful;—in short, that whilst everything which belongs to the temporal power of Rome is utterly effete, alike incapable of

self-defence and of government, she has once more sought, by a bold assertion of her spiritual power and her spiritual rights, to rescue and to maintain her temporal possessions and authority. The doctrine on which these appeals for support and these demonstrations of sympathy rest is this: that the whole temporal power of the Roman pontiff, and every portion of his temporal dominions, partake of the inalienable and indestructible character which the Roman Catholic Church attaches to his spiritual power — that this sacred character belongs even to the diplomatic transactions or legal instruments by which successive popes, condescending to accept such human securities, have at different times determined their territorial jurisdiction, — and that a dispute, which to heretical eyes assumes the vulgar form of a rupture between a deposed sovereign and a discontented people, is in reality a question of faith in the divine rights of the Vicegerent of Christ.

We undertake to show in the following pages that a more unfounded and delusive pretension was never raised, even by the Court of Rome. We hold that pretension to be utterly at variance with the true principles of the Latin Church itself, which has ever drawn a broad distinction between the temporal rights of the Roman pontiffs, differing in no respect from the temporal rights of other princes, and their spiritual authority. As regards the provinces which the popes hold or have recently held in Central Italy, as far north as the right bank of the Po, the tenure of those possessions is too recent, and the mode of acquisition too well known, to admit of a doubt on the subject. In the endless wars of Italy there is, in fact, scarcely a province which the popes have not, at one moment or another, claimed, usurped, or lost; but as an attempt is now seriously made to arm the Catholic world in defence of what is called the Patrimony of St. Peter, we shall proceed to show how entirely devoid of any spiritual claim on the veneration of mankind is the sovereignty of the chequered territories known as the Papal States. It is possible for the eye of superstition to see the mark of the finger of St. Peter on the throat of a John Dory, but it is impossible for historic criticism to find the smallest trace of apostolic handling in the acquisition of the patrimony of the Court of Rome.

It is important to our inquiry to know, first, how the Bishop of Rome came to exercise any political functions, and what was their character while the See of Rome was still subservient to the Empire. Up to and during the time of the early councils of the Church it is certain that the bishops of Rome had no superiority of rank above the bishops of Con-

stantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, or any other great patriarchal diocese. All the authority of the Church was concentrated in the councils, of which the Bishop of Rome was a simple member. The Church at that period was an universal European republic, with an elective representative constitution on the broadest democratic basis. The Episcopal deputies to the great Christian Amphyctyonic assemblies of Nicæa, Carthage, or Tyre presided over the spiritual interests of the whole Christian world, and their deliberations settled the form of creed which was to direct the future destinies of mankind. Had Constantine never transferred the seat of empire to the Bosphorus, the Bishop of Rome might never have enjoyed any greater independence than the Patriarch of Constantinople. But by the removal of the overshadowing supremacy of his imperial lord, the Pontiff of Rome, inhabiting the largest and most famous city of the world, the historic seat of universal dominion, hallowed with the blood of countless martyrs, and with the traditional residence, sufferings, and death of two of the chiefest apostles, was invested with a separate dignity and authority which served as a basis for all future usurpations. It must be added, also, that the popes manifestly made themselves the representatives of the popular sentiments of the Roman people in all matters both of religion and politics; and as the influence which the first popes possessed was the free homage of the citizens of Rome, the personal qualities of the majority of them must have been such as to command respect.

In the darkness of those tempestuous times, here and there a shadowy figure crosses the arena, but of the greater number the names are known and no more. But amid the calamities which fell upon Italy, when the whole continent rocked beneath the tramp of barbarian hosts; when the farms, villages, vineyards, and populations were visited with fire and sword; when the inhabitants of fortified towns beheld with trembling, from their walls, the flames and smoke of their desolated country, and heard the cries and groans of their countrymen, coupled like hounds, and dragged off into bondage; when the country around was reduced from smiling fertility to a dreary and plague-smitten wilderness; when the inhabitants perished of hunger by hundreds of thousands; there was abundant scope for the exercise of the episcopal virtues; and many, doubtless, followed the example of the courageous devotion of Leo the Great, and of the unwearied charity and humility of Gregory.

Moreover, the popes were ardent advocates of the favourite and popular tenets of the Romans. The Romans were passionately Catholic, or anti-Arian; and in the great Arian controversy the

Roman bishops showed great devotion to the Catholic cause. The Romans and Italians generally were deeply attached to the worship of images. The Roman bishops therefore defied the edicts of Leo the Iconoclast. Moreover, the exarchs of Ravenna endeavoured to reduce Rome to the position of the second city of Italy. The bishops of Rome showed for centuries a jealous endeavour to withstand the power of the archbishops of Ravenna, and to bring them under their control; and this would naturally cause the Roman to attach himself with gratitude to the one great and venerable dignitary of the empire left to him amid the deserted grandeur of Rome. But it was in their hostility to the Lombards that the popes showed themselves the most complete representatives of the feelings of the Roman people. The Lombards were Arians; the Romans, as we have said, vehemently Catholic. The hatred between the two nations was intense. Liutprand, the Bishop of Cremona, a Lombard, writes: —

'We despise so deeply the Roman name, that in our anger we know no greater insult for our enemy than to call him a Roman, for in this name alone we comprehend all that is ignoble, cowardly, luxurious, lying, and all the vices.'

On their side, the Romans were not slow to return the antipathy. In the letters of the bishops of Rome, which remain of the time of the Lombard domination, the Lombard name is never mentioned without execration. They are the fetid Lombards; the most impious Lombards. The only reproach against Charlemagne was, that he married the daughter of a fetid Lombard. Now the Lombard kingdom existed for 206 years. The people showed great aptitude for civilisation. The Lombard code of laws is the best collection of Gothic laws in existence. This formidable nation were Arians, and besides being Arians, they maintained in Italy a separate and exclusive existence. Unlike Theodoric and his Ostrogoths, they never amalgamated with the inhabitants. The result must have been, in time, that the Roman name, all remains of Roman institutions, and the Roman Catholic religion itself, would have perished before them. Except the Exarchate and Rome, they already possessed the whole of Italy: and when at last they conquered the Exarchate, the Roman pontiff, Gregory III., was convulsed with terror. In vain he wrote the most suppliant letters to Constantinople. The emperor Constantine Copronymus was, however, willing that he should apply to Pepin, king of the Franks. Pepin descended twice into Italy; the second time, at the pressing solicitation of a letter indited by

St. Peter himself, in which the apostle promised him all felicity, both in this world and the next, if he would free his church and tomb from the hated Lombards. The arms of Pepin were successful. The Exarchate was wrested from the Lombards, and the keys of its cities were placed on the altar of St. Peter. Twenty years passed by. Again the Church felt the perilous neighbourhood of the Lombards, and again its chief implored the assistance of Charlemagne. The son of Pepin likewise descended into Italy, and with the exception of the great Lombard duchy of Benevento, the dreaded kingdom disappeared under the dominion of the Franks.

But the presence of Pepin and Charlemagne in Italy marked a greater era in the history of the Papacy even than the overthrow of the Lombards. It was under these monarchs that the ambition of the Papacy for temporal domination first disclosed itself by undeniable evidence. Up to this time their attempts at aggrandisement had been confined to the acquisition of lands, farms, and chattels; but the forged document of the donation of Constantine, as well as the false decretals of Isidore, both of which were fabricated about the end of the eighth century, prove that at that time the ambition of the bishops of Rome, for both spiritual and temporal dominion, had not only palpably declared itself, but formed a resolute conception of the policy necessary to attain these ends.*

The donation of Constantine was probably invented expressly as a precedent for Pepin, and to stimulate his generosity and his piety. This document has, from the motives it discloses, more real historical importance than the donations of Pepin and Charlemagne or the pretended one of Louis-le-Débonnaire.

Neither Pepin nor Charlemagne could confer any rights which they did not themselves possess: the donation of Charlemagne comprised the whole of Italy, but many parts of the Peninsula,

* The patrimony of St. Peter in the times of Gregory the Great, consisted in the estates of the churches, which were very large, chiefly in Calabria, in Sicily, in the neighbourhood of Rome, Apulia, Campania, and Liguria; in Sardinia and Corsica; in the Cozian Alps; in Dalmatia and Illyricum; in Gaul; and even in Africa and the East. These were wisely and honestly administered by the great Pontiff. But this ecclesiastical property was wholly distinct from the temporal dominion of the Popes in Italy, which was entirely the creation of a later age. (See Dean Milman's 'Latin Christianity,' vol. i. p. 441.) Even when Pepin ceded to the Pope the Italian territories conquered from the Lombards, the Papal representatives who received the homage of the authorities and the keys of the cities, continued to speak of the *Republic* of Rome.

especially the Lombard duchy of Benevento, which he had been unable to subdue, owed him no subjection at all. At all events, it would appear that the donation, so far as valid, conferred no more than a sort of feudal tenure under the emperor. For Charlemagne himself coined money, and exercised acts of sovereignty, over the city of Rome, as well before as after he bore the imperial name. The fabrication of the donation of Constantine, as well as the unauthorised bestowal of the title of Emperor by the Bishop of Rome upon Charlemagne, was doubtless a joint scheme by which the pontiff hoped to put his temporal power, which consisted of mere administration of portions of the diocese under his charge, on a more secure footing. Up to the time of Charlemagne the pontifical briefs ran in the name of the Emperor of the East; after the coronation of Charlemagne they ran in the name of the Emperor of the West.

The two centuries which followed the decease of Charlemagne were the darkest among those dark ages. After the disintegration of the mighty empire which his genius had created, every portion of Europe was reduced to desolation by the parricidal and fratricidal wars which arose among his degenerate descendants. The invasions of the Hungarians, the Saracens, and Normans were attended with such ferocities that the litanies of the churches cried to Heaven for protection from the arrows of the invaders, and the end of the world was thought to be at hand. Henry the Fowler and Otho the Great achieved the deliverance of Europe and Christendom by the defeat of the Hungarians, and secured the remnants of civilisation from impending destruction. And it was but natural, since the chiefs of the House of Saxony rivalled the achievements of those of the Carlovingians, that the Bishop of Rome should appeal to them for the same protection.

The appeal of John XII. to Otho the Great marks an important epoch in the annals of the world. It was the commencement of that connexion of Italy with Germany which has been attended with eight centuries of enmities and disaster. The political and social condition of Italy had altered materially since the first establishment of the Carlovingian dynasty. Feudal institutions had everywhere taken root, and the dukes, marquises, and counts of the great fiefs of Ivrea, Susa, Friuli, Spoleto, and Tuscany were contending for the empire of the peninsula. In the general rise of feudalism, the pope himself had become little more than a feudal superior elected among the powerful and warrior barons of Rome. The annals of the Papacy, for more than a hundred and fifty years, are a dreary succession of revolutions, licentiousness, and crime. Six popes

were deposed, two murdered, one mutilated. Theodora and her daughter Marozia, patrician women of scandalous lives, rivalled the monstrous vices of the Messalinas and Clodias of old Rome, and disposed of the chair of St. Peter at will among their paramours and their progeny. John XII., the grandson of Marozia, became pope at the age of nineteen; and it was this youth, at once priest and soldier, contaminated with all the most hideous vices which degrade human nature, whose palaces were scenes of continual debauchery, whose reputation was such that even in the days of his successor, pilgrims were deterred by it from visiting the tomb of St. Peter,—who, through fear or jealousy of Berenger II. the Italian emperor, invited the Germans into his country, and who, by conferring the imperial crown on Otho, entailed upon it centuries of foreign invasions. Under the Othos and the succeeding German emperors, the bishopric of Rome became the spoil of the intrigues of the nobles or of the caprice of the populace, subject to the approving voice of the emperors, who indeed often forced their own creatures upon the people and nobility of Rome. The profligate vices of the bishops of Rome, during this period, brought their authority into hatred and contempt. Under Crescentius, the Romans endeavoured to shake off the yoke both of the Empire and the Church, and to revive the ancient Republic; and the authority of the Church of Rome had perhaps departed for ever, had not one imperious spirit amid the ranks of the monastic clergy, meditating on the traditions of the Church, burning with indignation at the aspect of its servile and degraded condition, conceived and organised a stupendous scheme for its renovation and aggrandisement. Gregory VII. was the Cæsar or Napoleon of the Church. He found it an anarchical republic, and he left it an autocratic empire.

It does not fall within the scope of this article to say more of this extraordinary man, or of the great pontiffs of the Middle Ages who were inspired by his example, than will explain their share in establishing the temporal dominion of the Papacy. Hildebrand was the incarnation of the spiritual desire of the Middle Ages for emancipation from the empire of brute violence and feudalism. It is not to be doubted that if Hildebrand had lived in later times, both his wisdom and his character would have led him to mould the policy of the Papal Chair to suit the changed circumstances of Europe. His truly great spirit would have ennobled the Papacy in any age. His design was, amid the turmoil and havoc he saw around him, to found a government unique in the history of man; an universal empire, in which the supreme power should be pos-

sessed by a real vicegerent of Christ, placed apart from the whole human race, and invested with unlimited authority over all the emperors, kings, and potentates of the world, — but on this condition — that he should be a type of the highest virtues and perfections of human nature. What he wished to found was a dynasty of saints — *Romanus pontifex efficitur omnino sanctus.* This was to be the keystone of the great arch of spiritual dominion which Hildebrand designed to establish upon the earth. Inspired with that great idea, with a soul torn with anguish at the servile subjection of religion, with a heart full of compassion for the calamities of the human race, the prey of the brutal passions of barbarism and tyranny, he determined to make the Church an ark of refuge amid the contending floods of violence and rapine, a secure retreat for piety and justice from the brutal license of those iron times, the mother and guardian of a spiritual caste who should be the leaders and protectors of oppressed humanity. It was for this that he dared to arm himself with the anger of God, and to remain with unabated confidence in the face of insult and disaster. *Dilexi justitiam et odii iniquitatem*, were the last words uttered by the peasant-born priest, who had conceived the only plan for the redemption of the human race which it was possible to conceive in the despair and horror of a miserable age. To carry out so mighty a project he had need of a superhuman strength of will and all the unrelenting austerity and arrogance of soul which he showed in the famous scene at Canossa. Doubtless his character was not one of Christian virtue alone; but it happens at certain epochs of the world that men are marked even in their failings as though by the finger of God to perform an allotted portion of the work of civilisation. The reputation of the great inventor of the mediæval policy of the Roman Church has had to suffer from the abuse made of his institutions by those who, from entire want of genius, grandeur, originality, and generosity, were utterly incapable of appreciating the real worth of his reforms or the reason of their invention, and blindly and servilely followed a system no longer adapted to the age in which they lived.

But although the great idea of Gregory was destined to fail of success from its own inherent defects, and because the results he wished to arrive at have been obtained by means it was impossible for him to divine, — by the universal spread of knowledge through the press, by the decay of feudalism, by the great triumphs of the inventive genius of man, and by all the other mighty influences which Romanism refuses to recognise — it is to him that the Papal power is indebted for its constitution and its

privileges at the present hour. By him was its present mode of election devised and carried out, through which it was emancipated from a servile dependence on the Empire, as well as placed above the passions and the influence of the populace; and by his policy it was that the very title of Pope became the exclusive appellation of the bishops of Rome.

Looking only to the effect of the pontificate of Gregory VII. on the temporal dominions of the Holy See, if we except the donation of the famous Countess Matilda, the heiress of the counts of Tuscany, his Amazonian ally and champion in his great contest with the Empire, it was not very considerable. Indeed, Hildebrand, at the same time that he contended for universal spiritual dominion, could not maintain his position in the city of Rome, and once nearly perished in a tumult of the populace. Nevertheless by the donation of the Countess Matilda, as well as by the suzerainty they claimed over the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, the Popes had at all events acquired fresh pretensions which they lost no occasion of agitating. But it is difficult to see what real validity there is in either of these claims. The Countess Matilda made a gift to the Holy See of all the goods (*bona*) which she possessed *jure proprietario*. She held by inheritance of the great fiefs of the Empire, Mantua, Modena, and Tuscany, as well as of the duchy of Spoleto and the March of Ancona, which are supposed to have been allodial. The fiefs of the Empire she was unable to alienate, even were the words of the donation sufficiently large; and if by the rules of feudal law she had power to alienate her allodial estates, she could not divest the Empire of its right of sovereignty over them.

The donation of the Countess Matilda was immediately on her decease declared invalid by the Emperor of Germany, Henry V., who took possession of the whole of her domains. The donation, however, like the fictitious and illusory gifts of Constantine, Pepin, Charlemagne, and Louis-le-Débonnaire, served as a pretext for the usurpations of the Papacy when the spiritual ambition of Hildebrand was supplanted by one of more earthly alloy.*

* Before the days of Gregory VII., the popes had acquired the claim of *suzerainty over Naples*, which subsequently gave them occasion to invite the House of Anjou to take possession of that kingdom to the destruction of Italy. Leo IX., in a military expedition against the Normans, was taken prisoner, and to obtain his liberty he, without any title whatever, invested the Normans with their conquests, who, conceiving the Papal investiture to be a better title than the sword, consented to hold their territories as a fief of the Holy See. That faithful son of the Church, the King of the Two Sicilies, refused, on his restoration to his continental dominions in 1815, to

Not until the return of the popes from Avignon in 1376 can the temporal dominion of the Holy See be said to have had anything more than an illusory existence. During the three centuries which followed the pontificate of Hildebrand, the papal power was such as not to degenerate altogether from the magnificent scheme of its great founder. With Urban II. it inspired all the mail-clad nobles and warriors of Europe with the chivalrous enthusiasm which resulted in the conquest of Palestine. With Alexander III. it put itself at the head of the great Lombard league, and identified its cause with that of the Italian liberties, and played a leading part in the glorious episode of Italian history which resulted in the treaty of Constance. This was the era in which kings submissively led the palfrey of the Pontiff of Rome by the bridle. But from the time of Alexander III., the mere earthly spirit of temporal aggrandisement began to prevail. The power, however, of the Papacy was never displayed with more audacity and vigour than under Innocent III. and Innocent IV. Yet, nevertheless, though they made and unmade kingdoms, and attempted to hold all the princes of Europe in vassalage, — though they reigned supreme over the conscience of Europe, directed crusades against infidels, and ruthless persecutions against nations accused of heresy, — though they carried on an unremitting war against the House of Hohenstauffen, dethroned and persecuted to death the last scions of that race, and pursued them beyond the grave with all the anathemas of priestly vengeance, their position within the dominions over which they aspired to rule was in as precarious a condition as ever. Innocent III., by following in the steps of Alexander III. and allying himself with the municipal liberties of the towns, contrived to get his suzerainty acknowledged over a portion of the territory now claimed as the patrimony of St. Peter; but neither Innocent IV. nor his successors could maintain the privileges granted to Innocent III. And in Rome itself, the pontiffs, whose anger was dreaded with superstitious horror throughout Europe, passed lives of peril and restraint, and were often driven into exile by the turbulent factions of the Colonnas, Orsini, Frangipani, and Savelli, or by the republican outbursts of the people.

And here it may be remarked, that one of the chief causes of the worldly success of the Papacy has been its belief in its own perpetuity. Strong in their conviction of being able to outlive

continue the present of the *chinea*, or white palfrey, to the Pope as his feudal superior, though the Neapolitan provinces were in fact the most ancient of all the temporal possessions of the Holy See.

all antagonism, the popes have never omitted to possess themselves of any claim however futile; no matter how long circumstances may have compelled them to allow their pretensions to remain dormant, at the proper moment they have known how to advocate them with success. Moreover, some of the most important privileges of the Church have been obtained during minorities or changes of dynasty in the Empire, accidents to which the Papacy from its constitution was not liable. The minority of Henry IV. was one example of this, that of the son of Frederick II. was another, but the most striking instance of all was in the pontificate of Nicolas III.

Charles of Anjou was one of the many strangers introduced by the popes into Italy, to its ruin and desolation. With the aid of the popes Charles had extinguished in blood the House of Hohenstauffen, and he had extended his influence over the whole of Italy. But Rodolph of Hapsburg being, after a long interregnum, elected Chief of the Empire, aspired to the title of King of the Romans. The position of Nicolas III. was most favourable, placed between the two rival powers, and he determined to lean towards whichever should bid highest for his support. By skilful diplomacy Rodolph, who was ignorant of the rights of his crown and of the very geography of Italy, was induced to release the imperial supremacy over all the possessions already granted to St. Peter.

This document is the real foundation of the Papal power. The dominions comprised in this charter of Rodolph (1278) are pretty nearly coextensive with the Papal territories of the present day; they extended from Radicofani to Ceperano, included the march of Ancona and the duchy of Spoleto, which came from the Countess Mathilda, the exarchate of Ravenna, and all the territory of the former imperial acts of donation. But the rights of the Empire thus released were only an ill-defined, and in many cases merely nominal, suzerainty over small principalities, or over cities which had for centuries enjoyed free municipal constitutions. Bologna, for example, was at that time one of the most important cities of Italy; the first charter of its liberties was as old as the time of Otho the Great: its municipal independence was acknowledged by the Emperor Henry V. in 1112. It had the right of coining money, of electing its consuls and magistrates, and its rule extended over a great part of the Æmilia. Its university was the largest in Italy, numbering at one time 15,000 students, and its school of law was famous throughout Europe. The town had always taken the Guelf side, and had been a most useful ally of the Papacy. With their own army they defeated and took prisoner Henzius, the natural son of Frederick

II., and his lieutenant in Lombardy; they passed a law, never to allow the son of the German Emperor to be ransomed. Henzius was lodged in a sumptuous apartment, in the house of the podestà, visited by the Bolognese nobles, and kept in a splendid captivity till his death. On another occasion they successfully carried on war against the Venetians with an army of 40,000 men in the field. The traveller at the present day is struck with the antique air of municipal grandeur which invests the public buildings, palaces, and squares of Bologna; and the spirit of her inhabitants has shown itself again and again, in times of peril, not to have degenerated from the days of her old renown, notwithstanding the debasing nature of the tyranny she has so long endured. Bologna, in 1447, acknowledged the authority of Nicolas V., on condition of preserving its old independence. The convention was ratified by succeeding popes. Julius II. threatened with the wrath of God and His Apostles Peter and Paul, whoever should violate the liberties of the Bolognese.

The other towns of Central Italy enjoyed equal municipal privileges, and the small republic of San Marino yet subsists to prove what vitality there was in those time-honoured municipalities which elsewhere have perished under the perfidious violence and oppressive atmosphere of a Papal government.

That line of the popes which may be called the dynasty of Hildebrand ended in Boniface VIII. The old spirit died out in that violent, profligate and ambitious pontiff with a tragic agony not unbecoming the unbending pride which had so long disturbed the world. When taken prisoner by the Colonnas, whose castles he had overthrown, and by the emissaries of the French king, against whom he had fulminated in vain the anathemas of the Church, he was dressed in full pontifical robes; and the venerable aspect of the aged pope, then eighty-six years of age, awed the rude soldiery. But the humiliation was more than his haughty spirit could endure—he refused all nourishment, spoke no word, and rejected all consolation. At length, finding himself alone, he bolted the door of his apartment, and, after a long delay, it was broken open: his body was found lifeless in the bed, the staff he daily used gnawed with his teeth in his frenzy, and covered with foam; his grey hairs were dabbled with blood; and it seemed that, unable to endure his defeat, the implacable old man had staggered to his bed, after having dashed his head against the wall in a paroxysm of inconsolable frenzy at his destiny. It was not unfitting that the end of such immeasureable ambition should be suicide and madness.

The secession of the popes to Avignon, after Boniface VIII., was followed by the darkest period of the Middle Ages, whether

we look to the internal corruption and profligacy of the exiled church, or to the condition of Italy. Rome itself became a wilderness, where the herdsmen of the Campagna, almost as barbarous as the subjects of Evander, alone peopled the ruins of the Imperial city. The money extorted from the whole Christian world was spent by the popes in exciting sanguinary wars against the free states of Italy, and in endeavouring to establish their temporal dominion over the country which Rodolph of Hapsburgh had released from the suzerainty of the Empire. The condition of this portion of Italian territory was more wretched than that of any other of the Peninsula. There was no republic or potentate strong enough to form a rallying point for the rest: while the petty tyrants who had arisen among the republics — the Manfredi of Faenza, the Malatesti of Rimini, the Ordelaffi of Forli, and the Polenta of Ravenna — rivalled in their continual quarrels the great houses of Visconti, Gonzaga and Este in the north; and the republics of Perugia, Viterbo, and Orvieto reproduced the factions of Florence, Pisa, and Genoa without emulating their glory; the popes, who might have exercised their power most beneficially in alleviating the miseries of a distracted country, aggravated the wretchedness of the people by selfish efforts at usurpation. Their vicars and legates — Bertrand de Poiêt, the Cardinals Albornoz, and Robert of Geneva — desolated the country at the head of bands of savage mercenaries, with the most lawless *condottieri* of the time in their pay. The savage bandits, whom the gold of Avignon allured to its service, sacked and burnt the houses of both friend and foe. At the captures of Faenza and Cesena (1377) nine thousand persons of every age, sex, and condition were put to the sword. During the massacres the legate of the Vicar of Christ exhorted his troops to the slaughter, and in triumphant fury shouted to them to spare none. Old and young, men and women, priests, monks and nuns, all perished; the wild Bretons, who formed part of the army of the French Pope, seized children by the feet and dashed their heads against the wall; none survived but those who were able to flee away.

The news of these horrible catastrophes fled from town to town, and inspired the inhabitants with fresh indignation against the Papal government, when the pope, Gregory XI., died. By a strange fatality, he had just come to visit Rome. Had it not been for this accident, the seat of the Papacy might never again have been fixed in the Eternal City. It had seemed, indeed, that the pope would have subsided into a mere French patriarch. The Avignon popes were all French, a large majority of the College of Cardinals were French, and the policy

of the Holy See had been subservient to that of France, and fraught with misfortune to Italy. But the last remnant of the Roman people had been reminded not long before by Cola di Rienzi of their ancient glory and of the share they once possessed in the Papal elections, and they naturally observed that the enormous revenues of the Church which once went to enrich Rome were now expended for their destruction. They determined to have an Italian pope: they beset the Conclave with loud cries—*Romano lo volemo o almeno Italiano.* Of the cardinals who formed the Conclave, eleven were French, four only Italian, and one Spaniard; but, fortunately or unfortunately, the French were divided into two factions, and the result was that a Neapolitan was elected, who assumed the style of Urban VI.

The violent temper of the new pope affronted the cardinals immediately after his election: they seceded from Rome, and at Fondi created an anti-pope, the notorious Robert of Geneva, the author of the massacre of Cesena; who, as though in derision, took the title of Clement VII.; and thus commenced the famous schism, in which Europe beheld with astonishment two infallible popes launching at each other the anathemas of the Church, and accusations of the most sordid and brutal of vices. Before the Council of Constance could put a stop to the scandal, the ecclesiastical censures were brought into such contempt that the world was ready for the revolution of the Reformed Churches. Indeed, among the popes who succeeded to the Papal chair, appeared, one after another, types of every crime and licentiousness, until all were united in the person of Alexander VI., the Heliogabalus of the Papacy. The life of Urban VI. was more scandalous than that of the most scandalous popes of the tenth century. Six cardinals, who were preparing a remonstrance against his vices, were subjected to torture in the pope's presence, tied up in sacks, and thrown into the sea. Boniface IX. disquieted the people by his venality and nepotism. Balthasar Cossa, a vile and factious intriguer, poisoned his predecessor and obtained the tiara. Eugenius IV. commenced his pontificate by a persecution of the Colonnas and the murder of 200 of their adherents. His miserable policy and restless extravagance caused him to be driven from Rome by a revolution which proclaimed the Republic. Pius II. (Æneas Sylvius) forms a bright exception; but his successor, Paul II., commenced his pontificate with perjury, and disturbed Italy with his restless ambition and disregard of every right, divine and human. His successor, Sixtus IV., surpassed him in every vice, squandered away the revenues of the Church, and profaned its highest

dignities, by bestowing them on his nephews, five worthless youths, whose pomp, vanity, and debauched lives were the scandal of all. The very *valet de chambre* of this pope, a boy of twenty, was made a cardinal; he was supposed to be an accomplice in the conspiracy of the Pazzi, and had one of the Colonnas murdered in his house. However, the pope who succeeded Sixtus IV. was so feeble and corrupt that the very vices of his predecessor appeared in advantageous contrast. Innocent VIII. was governed by still baser parasites, and his administration was contaminated with still filthier vices. His necessities were such that he was obliged to pawn the tiara. He had seven illegitimate children by different mistresses, whom he publicly recognised, and among whom he distributed the immense revenues of the Church. In his last illness he endeavoured to prolong his life by a transfusion of blood, and three youths were uselessly sacrificed in the endeavour to prolong the earthly enjoyments of a worthless old man. It is no marvel that a College of Cardinals, composed of the creatures of such predecessors, should have given to the world such a pontiff as Alexander VI., who, with his illegitimate children and the debauched ministers of his pleasures, ran through the whole nomenclature of crime from barefaced assassination to the most refined treachery and dissimulation, and has affixed to his reign an indelible brand of impiety and infamy.

Nevertheless, his son, Cæsar Borgia, the type of the most hideous vices in the modern annals of princely depravity, was regarded as a benefactor by the populations of the Romagna entrusted to his rule. Endowed with dauntless valour, with consummate craft, with military talent, and with the highest strength, dexterity, and beauty of limb and body, he had made his vices and his crimes subservient to the interests of the people of the Romagna, whom the infirm purpose and reckless mismanagement of preceding popes had made the prey of the sanguinary tyrants who were spread over the country. The dreadful merit of Cæsar Borgia consisted in subduing some of these petty lords by means of the others, and then removing his allies with the cord, the dagger, or the bowl. Property was protected under his rule with a respect never known before, and the very instruments of his justice, as soon as their rule of necessary severity was over, were quietly executed, and their bodies exposed to the public gaze. The people of Cesena crowded early one morning, with looks of mingled horror and satisfaction, around a scaffold in the market-place, which upheld the body of one of Cæsar's captains cloven in two, with the bloody axe lying by, and no word of explanation. These were

the remains of the governor before whom they had all trembled but the day before, of whose inexorable cruelty he had made use to establish order and to clear the district of malefactors, and for whom he had no further occupation.

Julius II. consummated the work thus commenced. This pontiff — who from youth upwards preferred the cuirass to the cassock, who entered Mirandola through the breach, and desired Michael Angelo to portray him with a sword in his hand — is nevertheless one of the popes on whose pontificate the Italians can look with most respect. He possessed a certain rude air of grandeur and generosity. He ruled without nepotism. He subjected the whole of the territory claimed by the Church to its dominion; under his dominion the petty tyrants died out — the Manfredi of Faenza, the Ordelaffi of Forli, and the Baglioni of Perugia. He respected, however, the municipal franchises and independence of the towns: and his proclamation before his death, that he would 'free Italy 'from the barbarians,' has caused his character to be judged with more favour than it really deserves; for Julius II., by his promotion of the infamous League of Cambrai for the spoliation of Venice, had been the means once more of introducing foreign armies into Italy, with all the rapine and murder which in those days of ruthless warfare followed in their train. Nevertheless, the last hope which Julius II. held out to Italy was one which found an echo in every Italian heart.

The misery and exhaustion of the country had arrived at such a pitch, swept as it had been ever since the fatal invasion of Charles VIII., by the destroying hordes of French, Spaniards, Swiss, and Germans, that it was clear that but one alternative now remained for Italy — national independence or death. National independence and the expulsion of the barbarians had become the prayer of every state and province in Italy. But Italian affairs were involved in such a labyrinth of oppression, perfidy, and intrigue, that it was impossible to extricate them, unless some great power could be found to take the lead in a war of independence. The incongruities which have excited such astonishment in the political schemes of Macchiavelli are to be explained by the changing nature of the impediments to Italian freedom, and the successive alterations which took place in his opinions as to the means of overcoming them. Whether a prince or whether a republic should effect the deliverance of Italy, was immaterial. The desire of Macchiavelli and of all Italy was to have Italy free: '*Puzza ad ognuno questo barbaro dominio.*' But amid

the horrible calamities which then were poured into the peninsula from every side, none was greater than that two members of the house of Medici, who had extinguished the liberties of Florence, should at that conjuncture have filled the chair of St. Peter. From the moment that Leo X. assumed the lead in Italian politics the doom of Italy was sealed. A cardinal at thirteen, his whole life was a sort of derisive buffoonery of the sacred character which was thrust upon him. A prodigal, a voluptuary, he scandalously dissipated the enormous revenues which the economy of Julius II. had collected together*; and while the interests of the Church, of Italy and of Christendom, were at stake, he disregarded every right interfering with either his selfish enjoyments or the aggrandisement of his family. By secretly conspiring with Charles V. he again brought down upon the devoted plains of Italy all the horrors of war, and the calamities thus let loose, and increased by the cowardice, irresolution, and malignant treachery of his cousin, Clement VII. (Julian dei Medici) resulted in the disastrous defeat of Pavia, which gave Italy up to the dominion of Charles V., in the sack of Rome by the savage rabble of the Bourbon, and in the capitulation of Florence, after a siege in which she displayed an ineffectual heroism worthy of the best days of her independence. The whole Christian world was convulsed with horror at the news of the sack of Rome, but the mind of Clement VII. was engrossed with the scheme of imposing a bastard nephew on the republic of Florence; by a flagitious compact with the Emperor, he betrayed the liberties of Italy, on condition that the army, yet fresh from the sack of Rome, should besiege and deliver up the republic of Florence to an illegitimate descendant of the Medici. Betrayed on all sides, the republic prepared itself for resistance. The citizens repaired the fortifications; they destroyed the suburbs, and laid waste the vineyards, orchards, olive-grounds, and pleasant gardens around the beautiful city, and the citizens enrolled themselves to defend the walls. One of their number, Francesco Ferrucci, displayed a heroism and a military genius in the field worthy of the birthplace of Dante. In one of his expeditions, the imperial and pontifical soldiers surrounded him on all sides: wounded severely with two arquebuse-shots, he had himself carried into the fight in a chair; dying, pierced with wounds, he supported himself on his lance, beneath the burning sun of August, and rejected all proffers of surrender. At last he was

* Leo X., it was said, spent the revenues of three pontificates, his predecessor's, his successor's, and his own.

taken prisoner, and brought before the papal general in a neighbouring fortress; the latter stabbed him with his dagger: Ferrucci cried, as he fell, 'You stab a dead man!' He was the last hope of the Florentines. By that dagger-thrust Clement VII. put an end to the Florentine Republic and decided the fate of Italy. It must be remembered that the popes introduced the Spaniards into the peninsula, and that Clement VII. afterwards, through fear of their power, joined the League against them. Of this war Giberto, his confidential minister, said, 'It is not a question of petty vengeance, 'a point of honour, or a single city. *This war will decide the 'deliverance or the eternal slavery of Italy.*' All Italians felt the same, and yet Clement betrayed his allies and countrymen and turned the arms of the Spaniards against Florence. The energy of the resistance of the doomed city was caused by the conviction that the fate of Italy depended on it. The city capitulated on the 12th of August, 1530, upon favourable conditions, which were observed as might be expected by princes without faith towards men without power. From that day Charles V., with the combined forces of Spain and Germany, held Italy at his mercy, and was more absolute there than any monarch since the days of Charlemagne.

By this time, however, the popes had established their power over the States of the Church. Their authority, we can see, had been first erected on a sure basis by Julius II., who died in 1513. But the scheme was as old at least as the days of Pepin. It was conceived in fraud, prosecuted with treachery and massacre, and consummated by a pope more fitted to be a captain of Landsknechts than the Vicar of Christ. This extraordinary usurpation thus took more than seven centuries for its execution. Nothing remained for the following popes to do but to suppress, one by one, the municipal rights which their predecessors had guaranteed. Every city had bargained for its independence. Fano acknowledged the popes, early in 1463, on condition of choosing its own *podestà*. Julius II., when he drove the Baglioni out of Perugia, restored the old liberties of the town. Sinigaglia was only to pay 2000 ducats a year in recognition of the pope's sovereignty, and was to send its own troops into the field. Bologna was to have complete control, through its council, over its finances, and to have troops of its own. Julius II. annexed not a single town of the Romagna without granting them settled privileges, which were designated their 'Ecclesi-'astical Freedom!' and it was a rule that the president at the head of the administration of the Romagna should be a layman. And here it is to be remarked that in the Papal States, as in

Italy at large, the absence of anything like a parliament or estates, as a rallying point for the whole, facilitated the suppression of the franchises of the towns, one by one, at the convenience of the princes. Ancona was one of the first towns to fall. It had refused to pay more taxes than were stipulated in its charter. Under the pretext of defence against the Turks, Clement VII. caused a fortress to be built in the city: when the works were complete, he garrisoned it, and, in September, 1532, surprised the town with an armed force, who were drawn up in front of the town-hall, where the Anziani were sitting, entirely unsuspecting, in consultation about the government of the city. Defence was attempted, but found useless. All arms had to be delivered up; sixty-four nobles were exiled, and the old liberties annihilated. The freedom of Perugia was destroyed in like manner. Paul III. doubled the salt-tax; Perugia resisted the imposition. Ten thousand Italians and 3000 Spaniards were directed against it under one of the pope's nephews, Pier-Luigi Farnese. The city was compelled to surrender on the 3rd of June, 1540. It sent delegates to ask pardon of the pope. They appeared in the portico of St. Peter's, in mourning garments, with halters round their necks; but in vain,—their franchises were annihilated, and their town dealt with in the same way as Ancona.

The liberties of Rome had already perished. The Romans, up to the return of the Papacy from Avignon, had always maintained their municipal sovereignty against the usurpations of the pope, and amid the sanguinary factions of the Roman nobles. The senate for 300 years had preserved the prerogative of coining money. But the popes, on their return, with the aid of foreign tribute maintained a standing army, and thus suppressed the republic. Martin V. was the first who coined money with the papal superscription. The Romans, under the young and eloquent noble, Stephen Porcaro, made a last effort to shake off the incubus of papal rule. But the movement was quickly suppressed. Porcaro and nine of his confederates were hanged, and the spirit of Arnold of Brescia, of Brancaleone, and of Rienzi resigned itself to sloth and despair. One by one, all the municipalities of the Papal States followed each other to the grave, and every institution of the country was absorbed by the uncontested ascendancy of ecclesiastical powers and of the canon law.

Two important additions, however, were made after 1530 to the papal territory,—the duchies of Ferrara and of Urbino. The House of Este had reigned in sovereign power at Ferrara over a powerful principality for 400 years. Modena also was theirs. The popes had been content with the empty honours of the

suzerainty over Ferrara. Modena was a fief of the Empire. The Duke Alfonso II., finding himself without children, had named Don Cæsar D'Este, a descendant of Alfonso I., as his successor. The new duke was proclaimed amid the shouts of the populace. The Emperor Rodolph II. invested him with the fief of Modena. But the pope, Clement VIII., less generous than Rodolph, seized on a favourable conjuncture of European politics to refuse the investiture of Ferrara: he determined to annex it to the Holy See. With all the lugubrious apparatus of excommunication,—with extinguished tapers, amid the confused noise of drums, trumpets, and cannon, the pope, from the loggia of St. Peter's, formally deposed Don Cæsar D'Este, and released his subjects from their allegiance. The result was that Don Cæsar was forced to make, on the 12th of January, 1598, a formal renunciation of Ferrara, Commacchio, and part of the Romagna, and to content himself with Modena, where his mild and equitable temper made him beloved, while the remnant of the glory of the House of Este embellished its capital. The Pope immediately erected a fortress in Ferrara, to overawe the inhabitants. The banqueting-houses, pleasure-grounds, and Belvidere of the dukes—retreats associated with the memories of a brilliant court, of Boiardo, Ariosto, Tasso, and Guarini,—were destroyed, and the calamitous benedictions of the Papacy gave its streets and palaces that desolate air of grandeur which it still retains.

The duchy of Urbino was also a fief of the Papacy, and was annexed in 1626. The aged Duke of Urbino, overcome with grief at the death of his only son, was persuaded to abdicate in favour of the Papacy; but the old prince lived long enough to see his country assume the same degrading uniformity of livery as all other ecclesiastical towns, to witness the dreary decay which fell on the once proud residence of the Montefeltri and the De la Roveri, and to hear his people utter the same maledictions against the avarice and tyranny of priests as arose from every district subjected to their dominion. These territorial acquisitions of the popes in Italy coincide in point of time with the great schism of the 16th century. Precisely as their spiritual authority over the world was assailed, and the resources drawn from foreign countries interrupted, the pontiffs sought to strengthen and extend their power as Italian princes, by conquest and by negotiation. But this temporal power was not so much the result of their spiritual dominion as it was a compensation for the loss of their spiritual supremacy.

Having thus traced the title by which the See of Rome enjoys its present possessions, it remains to show that such title has never been recognised as having any spiritual sanction,

or any notion of inviolability attached to it, even by the most Catholic Powers of Europe; and that its possessions have always in all international relations been dealt with in the same way as those of any merely temporal Power.

Already, at the peace of Westphalia, the great Catholic Powers of Europe had shown that even ecclesiastical matters were to be dealt with as European interests demanded, without respect to the Papacy. The terms of the treaty were such as the pope had expressly forbidden, and the spiritual articles of the peace of Westphalia were prefaced by the declaration that the contracting parties would not regard the opposition of any one whatsoever, whether of temporal or spiritual estate. The pope, by his nuncio, in vain protested against the execution of the treaty.

But the history of the duchies of Parma and Piacenza is a proof that neither the popes themselves, nor the Catholic Powers, Austria, Spain, or France, considered the estates of the Holy See of that indivisible nature which is now claimed for them. Julius II. had annexed the duchies of Parma and Piacenza: but Paul III. (Farnese), having filled the College of Cardinals with his creatures, obtained their consent to erect this part of the patrimony of St. Peter into an independent principality for his nephew, Pier-Luigi Farnese, to be feudatory to the See of Rome.* As the succeeding popes had no connexion with the House of Farnese, the dukes transferred their allegiance to the Emperors of Austria. The protests and claims of the popes

* The Bull of Paul III., by which this cession was made, recognised in precise terms the right and the expediency of detaching these principalities from the temporalities of the Church, 'in order 'to prevent wars and the scandal of sedition among the immediate 'subjects of the Church.' It then goes on in these words: —

'Superioribus siquidem diebus animo revolventes, quod civitates Placentiæ et Parmæ, provinciæ Galliæ Cispadanæ, à reliquo statu et dominio temporali Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ disjunctæ et separatæ, ac exinde plurimis indies periculis expositæ erant, maximisque pro earum custodiâ sumptibus indigebant, et quod, si aliquando ab aliquo occupatæ fuissent, quod non semel nostris temporibus tentatum fuerat, præter earundum civitatum omissionem, sedem prædictam bellis involvi omnemque ejus ditionem in periculum conjici necesse erat, ex quo turbandæ tam diu exoptatæ et tandem impetratæ pacis materia sine dubio nata fuisset'—On these grounds the Duchies are to be granted in fief to the Duke Pier-Luigi, with the full concurrence of the Sacred Consistory. What becomes then of the argument that a Pope *cannot* alienate his temporal dominions, the same arguments being entirely applicable to other provinces at this very day?

were continually disregarded, and when the House of Farnese was extinguished, Don Carlos took possession of Parma in 1732, again in opposition to the protests of the Papacy.

Nor has the Papacy been more happy with respect to Naples, Sicily, and Sardinia, which it has always claimed as fiefs of the Holy See. These claims have never been admitted by the European Powers; and in 1713 the Treaty of Utrecht disposed of Naples and Sardinia, as well as the duchy of Parma, without regard to the objections of the Pope.

Louis XIV. has certainly a melancholy claim, by persecution, to be considered an orthodox Catholic, yet he not only did not recognise the Pope's infallibility in temporal matters, not only did not consider the Pope's temporal power to have any different basis from that of the other governments of Europe, but he endeavoured to abridge the Pope's right of sovereignty in his own capital, and in 1663 he seized Avignon and the Comté Venaissin, and his troops actually crossed the Alps for the purpose of inflicting punishment on the Papacy for an insult offered, in the heat of a tumult in the streets of Rome, to his ambassador, and the Pope was compelled to take the humiliating step of sending his nuncio, Cardinal Chigi, to Paris to ask for pardon.

We have already had occasion in another part of this number to refer to the Political Testament of Prince Charles V. of Lorraine — a document drawn up by that eminent statesman and commander for the express guidance of the Sovereigns of the House of Austria, and which has been regarded for more than a century and a half as the basis of their policy towards the States of Italy. After recommending them to abandon all claims to Spain in order to establish their ascendancy in Italy the prince dealt thus with the pope:—

'C'est le pape qu'il faut pousser le dernier de tous les princes d'Italie, afin de reduire tous les autres sous le joug et au titre de gouverneurs seulement, avant que d'entreprendre de réduire le pape au seul domaine de la ville de Rome, en unissant par là le royaume de Naples avec le Milanais, bon grè, mal grè, et la force à la main. Il faut avoir à sa dévotion des docteurs profonds qui instruisent le peuple, de vive voix et par écrit, de l'inutilité et de l'illusion des excommunications, quand il s'agit du temporel — que Jésus Christ n'a jamais destiné à l'Eglise et qu'elle ne peut posséder sans outrer son exemple et sans intéresser son Evangile.'*

These were not the opinions of heretics or revolutionists, but

* Quoted by M. d'Haussonville (vol. iii. p. 377.) from a copy of the original document in the archives of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. See p. 79. of this number.

of a Prince of the Most Catholic House of Lorraine, addressed by him to the Emperor Leopold of Austria, in 1690, for the guidance of the Court of Vienna, and adopted by that Court as the traditional rule of its policy. Yet we are not aware that any modern writers of that class which M. Villemain and his friends now vituperate and condemn, have ever gone further in asserting the absolute nullity of the claims of the popes to temporal authority. Nor are examples wanting of the application of these principles by the Catholic Powers. In the famous dispute between the Venetians and Pius V., in which Paolo Sarpi took so prominent a part, the republic set the pope's excommunications at defiance, and were prepared to go to war with the pope about a matter in which he claimed spiritual jurisdiction.

In the only war of Italian origin of the seventeenth century, —a war caused by the rivalry of the Barberini and Farnese families,—the pope's territories were invaded by the allied forces of Parma, Modena, and Venice, and the pope was obliged to sign a disadvantageous treaty, by which he resigned his claims to the duchies of Castro and Ronciglione.

Finally, the Papal Court, after being compelled to submit to ecclesiastical sequestrations by the Catholic monarchs. Joseph II. and Leopold of Tuscany, almost equal to those of Henry VIII., was also constrained to accept the dismemberment of Avignon and the Comté Venaissin, in 1791, to which it had claims more just than to any other portion of its territory. Pius VI., likewise, by the treaty of Tolentino, surrendered the Romagna: and the treaties of 1815, which alone, in the international law of Europe, form the present title of the Pope to his dominions, gave the Polesina and a right of garrison in Ferrara and Commacchio to Austria, in spite of protests from Cardinal Consalvi on behalf of the Holy See. It has recently been stated by M. Thouvenel in a public despatch, and without contradiction, that in the course of the negotiations between Austria and the King of Naples (Murat) in 1814, the Court of Vienna offered to transfer to Naples a province of 400,000 inhabitants to be taken from the Papal territories, and undertook to reconcile the pope to this arrangement. Such was the estimation in which Prince Metternich held the claims of Rome to the sanctity and inviolability of her territorial possessions.

Thus we have seen that, both intrinsically and extrinsically considered, the claims of the Holy See to any inherent sanctity in the origin and nature of its temporal dominion, is an impudent fiction, baseless in itself and utterly unrecognised by the international law of Europe. Since, however, the Papal Govern-

ment lays claim to an exceptional character among the states of Europe, and actually owes its existence at the present time to the countenance given to this claim by the Catholic Powers, we cannot refuse to consider the effect it has exercised on the material and moral condition of its people. The Venetian envoys, and other observers of the sixteenth century, can scarcely find words to describe fitly the fertility and luxuriance of the rich and splendid province which had fallen to the lot of the popes. 'We travelled,' wrote the Venetian ambassadors in 1522, 'from Macerata to Tolentino, through the 'most beautiful country; hills and valleys covered with corn; 'for thirty miles nothing else was to be seen; we could hardly 'find a foot of land uncultivated: it appeared to us impossible 'to gather in such a quantity of grain, much more to find consumers for it.' The Roman States exported corn to its neighbours on all sides. Every district was famed for some especial produce. The trade at the sea-ports was most abundant, and carried on with the whole world. Levantine caravels crowded into the harbour of Ancona, freighted with all the rich produce of the East: on its quays were to be seen Armenians, Turks, Greeks, Flemings. The same Venetian ambassadors, in passing the people under review, say the inhabitants of the States of the Church made the best soldiers in Europe. The Venetians, indeed, drew their best troops from the Marches and from Romagna. And yet over so magnificent a territory, with so spirited and gifted a population, has the black leprosy of Papal decay crept wider and wider and sunk deeper and deeper, till its melancholy and dreary desolation is one of the most painful reminiscences of the traveller. From whichever side the Papal States are entered, whether from Naples or Tuscany, the difference is at once lamentable. It is possible at many places, like Chiusi for example, to look down on a valley and observe, on the Tuscan side, all the cheerful signs of life and cultivation, to see the ranks of mowers in the fields, and hear the vinedressers among the vines; while the Papal side exhibits a lifeless, monk-stricken, and desolate solitude. And things grow worse and worse till the traveller reaches the Eternal City, which is surrounded on all sides by an immense tract, which has been reduced, within the last three centuries, by Papal rule, from a district as luxuriantly fertile as the Terra di Lavoro, to a plague-bearing, uncultivated, uninhabitable wilderness.

This decline, vast as it is, is the logical consequence of a government which holds in honour mendicity, celibacy, and inactivity, and treats with contempt all the aspiring and busy energies of human nature. Under the republics, in the Middle

Ages, art, enterprise, industry and trade, were esteemed honourable; but in modern Rome the dominant caste consider it their chief virtue to have renounced the business of life, and no industry can bring a man honour or reward. It is necessary, in order to be treated with respect in Rome, to be one of the privileged classes—a priest, a prince, or a mendicant. The rest of the population, comprising all the intelligence and industry of the country, are comprehended, with a disgust due to their unclerical aspirations, under the denomination of *mezzo ceto*, and carefully excluded from any share of consideration, authority, or respect.

But though such a tyranny of caste, with the best organisation, would be more intolerable than a bureaucracy of mandarins in the midst of Europe, the vicious nature of its elective constitution is such that it may be fairly said no worse form of temporal power has ever been imagined by man. In 1827 years more than 260 popes have succeeded to the tiara, which gives an average of about seven years to each pontificate. As each new and aged pontiff seated himself in the chair of St. Peter, there flocked around him a fresh brood of harpies, whose boundless voracity was to be satisfied at the expense of the Roman people. Each pope brought to power not only a fresh batch of illegitimate children, nephews, nieces, and relatives, all insatiate and insatiable, but an entirely new administration, for it appears to have been a rule that no pope should retain the ministers of his predecessors. Consequently, no nation in Europe has had to support so continuous and rapid an elevation of new families to enormous wealth and princely dignities as the Roman people. Hence it was that, *quod non fecere Barbari, fecere Barberini*, that those stupendous palaces arose, to build which the most venerable ruins of ancient Rome were torn from their foundations. 'Every 'traveller,' says Gibbon, 'who views the Farnese Palace (built 'out of the spoils of the Coliseum) may curse the sacrilege and 'luxury of the upstart princes of the House of Farnese.' The Borghese, Ludovisi, Barberini, Pamphili, Chigi, Rospigliosi, and Odeschalchi families all started up in this way. The Braschi, the relatives of Pius VI.*, were the last family so founded; and though for the last fifty years no such flagrant instances of nepotism

* Pius VI., after draining the Pontine marshes at enormous expense, gave them over in one block (a tract sixty miles in length) to the Braschi family, and so converted them into the pestilential swamp they are at this day. The properties of the Borghese family are enormous. The Campagna of Rome can never be cultivated while held as it is now, by ecclesiastical corporations and princely proprietors who make impossible all attempts at improvement.

have arisen, and the present Pope has been entirely free from the slightest imputation of it, the same praise cannot be awarded to his ministers and his household.

It may seem strange, that under such a government, any class of the inhabitants of the Papal States should have sufficient moral feeling left to regard their government with invincible hatred and contempt. Nevertheless, with the exception of those princely houses and their retainers who have sprung from the Papacy, thrived by the Papacy, and been educated by the Papacy to perfect imbecility, such is undoubtedly the case. Nowhere in the world have the whole of the agents of government ever been regarded with such unutterable disgust and uncompromising execration. The Papal soldiery is looked on with such abhorrence that no inducement of pay, no increase of bounty, is sufficient to induce the peasantry to enlist in defence of the patrimony of St. Peter. To the absurd falsehood that the revolution of the Romagna was the work of a turbulent few, it is sufficient to reply, that in despite of all the offers and efforts of the Papal Government, it has been compelled to fill up the ranks of its army with mercenary heretics and Lutherans — the refuse of German populations, who would as soon fight for Nana Sahib as the Pope, provided the pay were the same. Nor can the Papal Government reply that this was through any lack of military feeling among its inhabitants. The number of Romagnoli who departed as volunteers to serve under the Sardinian flag, in the spring of 1859, amounted to 15,000; while the Pope, with a bounty of twenty scudi (4*l.*) per man, was able to procure but 150 soldiers from the whole of the four legations. If the military administration of Monsignor de Mérode and the command of General de Lamoricière be more successful, it is because, with genuine French energy, they have attempted to sweep away the contemptible abuses of the Italian members of the Papal Government, and appealed to other elements for the defence of the Pope than those which his own dominions can afford.

This contempt and hatred of everything in the shape of Pontifical authority has been increasing in intensity ever since the restoration of Pius VII. The populations had become accustomed to a secular administration under the French occupation; and the retrograde character of clerical rule too soon displayed itself for the people to regard a return to a national government as any advantage. All the privileges of an ecclesiastical caste were immediately resumed; and the more the inhabitants showed their repugnance to the tyranny of monks

and priests, the more intolerable were the measures taken to secure silence and compliance.* The government entered into a conspiracy with the most abandoned of its subjects to put down every aspiration for improvement. By means of the secret societies of the Sanfedists and Centurions, they formed a clandestine militia of assassins and thieves, spies and informers, villains exempted from taxes and stimulated by every prospect of immunity and advantage. When the mild and superstitious nature of Pius VII. was succeeded in the Papal chair by the narrow-minded and still more superstitious Leo XII., a new age of severity commenced. A regular crusade against liberal opinions was set on foot. Petty Neros, in cardinals' hats and red stockings, like Rivarola†, Pacca, and Pallotta, revived the engines of the Inquisition; they re-established torture; they adopted every means of annoyance and depression which malignity could devise. There was no refuge from the insults and the rapacity of the savages in pontifical uniform who raged over town and country. Noblemen, landed proprietors, advocates, men of letters and science, public functionaries and artisans, were tracked by spies and informers, insulted by the Papal rabble, dragged from their domiciles on the most trifling pretence, subjected to the *precetto politico*, and condemned to the indignity of being obliged to undergo the sacraments of the Church as a measure of police. Innumerable were the assassinations by the Papal mercenaries, innumerable the processes, sentences, incarcerations, banishments, deaths, and confiscations. The intensity of the hatred generated by the inordinate perfidy, cruelty, and stupidity of this feeble and bankrupt government, which owed its very existence to foreign bayonets, is well set forth in a passage of the manifesto, published by the inhabitants of the Roman States to the Governments of Europe in 1845:—

'And most important it is to repeat a thousand times over to the natives and Potentates of Europe, that the incessant political inquisitions and the unparalleled persecutions carried on in the Roman States from 1820 to our time, and the war against ideas, doctrines, and feelings, that are most honourable to the human race, and the summary judgments and multiplied assassinations committed in the name of law, have defiled and corrupted the general mind with hatred and vengeance, and have not only deprived the Roman Govern-

* See Farini, State of Rome, vol. i. book i.; also the 'Ultimi Casi 'di Romagna,' by the Marchese Massimo Azeglio.

† Cardinal Rivarola had a gallows erected before the gates of his own palace at Ravenna.

ment of all moral regard, but have brought us to consider it as the *unappeased and unappeasable foe to civilisation*, the despoiler of our substances, the conspirator against personal liberty and life,— to resist whom every instrument of defence and offence must needs be held allowable and honourable by the consciences whom it has perverted.'

It is true that on the accession of Pius IX. in 1847, a brighter era seemed to have dawned on Rome and on Italy. The new Pope made an attempt to reform his government, and in the following year he placed the administration in the hands of the most eminent layman who has ever exercised power in Rome. But, unhappily, the instruments which had been too faithful in the hands of despotism were faithless in those of freedom. No reliance could be placed on the army, and the leaders of the popular assembly soon engaged in a conspiracy which ended in the murder of Count Rossi, — an event which we shall ever regard as the most odious and atrocious crime that has sullied the history of modern Italy. But the task of regenerating the Papal government with such elements as were to be found amongst the Roman people was beyond even his strength, and he perished in the attempt.

Yet in spite of universal and unvarying evidence of the feelings of its populations, — in spite of the sanguinary pages of history of 1848 and 1849, — in spite of the late spectacle of the Romagna voting to unanimity for severance for ever from Papal misrule,— the Papacy still makes the foolish assertion that the discontented are few in numbers. If this be asserted of the Romagna where events have so unmistakably contradicted it, are the same assertions to be believed as to the state of public feeling in those portions of the Papal States where the government power is still supported by French soldiers, and where all publicity is impossible? If the discontented are few at Bologna, how many are they at Rome? Every incident which has been made public proves to us that the hatred of Papal authority is as vehement and irreconcilable in the capital of the Pope as in any other portion of his dominions; and that the continued support, by French arms, of so loathsome a tyranny is a scandal to the age, and one which must shortly cease.

The conduct of this country has been consistent from the first time that the public opinion of the people of the Papal States clearly manifested itself. We have constantly and uniformly declared that it was impossible that a government infected with such overwhelming abuses could continue to subsist amid the just indignation of its oppressed people. As early as 1832, Sir Hamilton Seymour protested, to the representatives of France,

Austria, and Prussia, on quitting the conferences which ensued subsequent to the Austrian intervention of the previous year, that in consequence of the irritating and obstinate spirit of the Papal Government, 'no body of Swiss would suffice to maintain tranquillity, which must sooner or later be disturbed.' The anomaly in Europe of so barbarous a government being supported in its dotage by the intervention of foreign Powers, has been pointed out, by none so constantly or so forcibly as ourselves; and the events which have happened and are about to happen, are but the results which successive governments of this country had long ago foreseen and foretold. It is impossible, after the astonishing unanimity of aversion to the Papal Government, shown in the late votes at Bologna and Ferrara, that these legations can ever again be subjected to the tyranny of the Vatican. This portion of the indivisible patrimony of St. Peter is rent away for ever from the grasp of the Pope; and no reasonable observer can imagine the misfortunes of the Papacy are yet at an end. The same aversion, the same national enthusiasm, has permeated every corner of the Pope's dominions and must lead to the same results. With the aid of French bayonets and foreign mercenaries the Papal Tiara may be enabled further to preserve a little while longer the barren ensigns of its power on its public buildings and *dogane*, but in the affections and hearts of its people its doom is irrevocably sealed, and a million of foreign soldiers would never be able to restore that sovereignty which alone is acceptable in the eyes of a just prince, the spontaneous allegiance and loyal respect of contented populations.

While the Head of the Roman Catholic Church is thus losing considerable portions of his temporal possessions, the Pope and his defenders still clamorously assert the indivisibility of his temporal and spiritual power. But we confess, if such indivisibility could be proved, we should look upon it as the strongest argument against his spiritual supremacy. It is impossible, with the history of the growth of the Papal power before us, to allow the so-called patrimony of Peter to be anything more than the accumulated winnings of the Papacy in a long game of political ambition. We have shown that the Papal title is the worst and most recent among European nations. If the spiritual power is inseparable from the temporal, so much the worse for the spiritual. But this also is a convenient fiction, devoid of all historical basis, created merely to throw a fraudulent veil of sanctity over the worst government in Europe. When the Papal power was at its greatest height, when it was really the inspiring genius of mediæval civilisation, it was, as we have seen, destitute of

that sovereign power which it now asserts to be indispensable to the exercise of its spiritual functions. From the days of Gregory the Great to those of Eugenius IV., it never enjoyed supreme authority within the walls of Rome; the popes were often indeed denied the liberty of residence there, and compelled to carry on the business of the Papacy at Viterbo, Anagni, Avignon, or elsewhere. This indispensable subservience of the temporal to the spiritual is a doctrine which doubtless grew out of the innovations of Gregory VII., but it is one which has no origin in fact, and its validity has never been admitted either by Europe at large or by the inhabitants of the Roman States. No profanation of Christianity can be greater than that it should be declared that its existence is in any degree dependent upon an execrable system of misgovernment, and the misery and degradation of three or four millions of Christian people. It is preposterous to assert that the Pope would be less independent relieved from his temporal dominion, than he has been under the protection of Austrian and French bayonets; on the contrary, it is precisely the possession of a temporal authority which he has not the strength to exercise or defend, which makes him entirely dependent on a foreign army of occupation. His vaunted independence since 1815 has resulted in a servile reliance on Foreign Powers for support, against a people in perpetual revolt. Even were the White Cross of Savoy to float over the whole Peninsula as the symbol of Italian nationality, it cannot be imagined that the position of an Italian Pope would be so ignominious as it has been under the shadow of foreign protection. Nor can we see that the deprivation of a single Italian of the political privileges incident to civil society, is necessary or expedient for Papal independence.

It were indeed to be hoped that the Church of Rome itself, instead of indulging in vain lamentations for the loss of its temporal power, would make a virtue of its necessities. The entire separation of all political functions from its spiritual authority may, if the occasion be turned to proper account, prove a means of salvation to itself. Perplexed by this union of two antagonistic characters, it has frequently declared it to be impossible to admit a change in its temporal constitution without also bringing about a revolution in the spiritual. By its hold on the temporal power, it has hitherto succeeded in resisting, with the most obstinate insensibility, all the concessions claimed by the new ideas and advancing civilisation of Europe. But if its temporal basis be removed from it, the

power of the Church would rest on the free allegiance of the consciences of believers.

In the course of this article we have dealt with the Papacy simply as a political institution, and considered its direct relations in that capacity to the people of the Roman States. We have not thought it necessary, at this moment, to review the history of its external policy since its restoration, in 1815, from exile and helpless prostration to the Chair of St. Peter by the united arms of Europe; we have not thought it necessary to dilate on the restless and aggressive pertinacity with which it has incessantly disquieted governments, assaulted the liberties of every denomination of Christians, and scattered broad-cast the dragon's teeth of religious intolerance and civil warfare. We have spared to dwell on its usurpations in this country and in Holland, on its machinations in Belgium, on its violence in Switzerland, on its intrigues in Austria and Catholic Germany; on the factious and all-grasping effrontery with which it pursued its encroachments in France to the destruction of the sound traditions of the Gallican Church. True to the principles of which this Journal has ever been the earnest advocate—those of perfect toleration,—we are as willing now as ever to combat the influence of Rome in foreign countries by free discussion; and to leave such matters to be decided, as they have been decided, by the voice of public opinion. Still less have we thought it proper to urge accusations against the morality of the priesthood of Rome; against the abuses of the confessional and of the sacred office; or to make any use of the imputations thrown on the Romish clergy by one of the books which stands at the head of this article, and which professes to be written by a member of the old Constituent Assembly of Rome. Were the whole hierarchy of Rome honest zealots—of unimpeachable lives—the situation of the Roman people in the present state of clerical despotism and tutelage would not be the less intolerable.

Severe as are the judgments, condemnatory as are the statements which we have brought against the Roman hierarchy from a political point of view, we conceive that it is a service both to religion and to Roman Catholicism, to hasten the disappearance of an incorrigible and perilous system of oppression—a system which day by day degrades the name of religion under the mask of religion, and brings greater scandal on Christianity and on Europe, by its perversion of those precepts which form the very spirit of the teaching of Christ. It is the unexampled hardship of the Roman people to be persecuted in their lives, in their liberties, and in their fortunes, by him

who professes to be the Vicegerent upon earth of the Divine Author of the Gospel of Love.

Moreover, we have considered the question apart from the wider field of Italian politics, which for the past two years has absorbed the attention of Europe. The Papal Question is the Gordian knot of Italian politics, and its solution is indispensable to any permanent settlement of the Peninsula. It also unhappily involves considerations directly affecting the interests and the faith of the Catholic Powers and of the Catholic populations of other states. In behalf of the Catholic Church, and of the principles of toleration, the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion, and the entire independence of its spiritual authority, must be protected by the strictest securities which European statesmen can devise; but in behalf of the peace of Europe we would earnestly implore the Catholics themselves to use to the head of the Church of Rome the language of firm and conciliatory admonition. The Italians likewise, if they continue to act with true political wisdom, will exercise extreme caution and prudence before they bring themselves anew into collision with the authorities at Rome, and rouse the apprehensions of the great Catholic Powers. By establishing law, order, and unity in the other portions of the peninsula, they will give to the Papal Government further opportunity of recognising the necessities of their position, as well as greater security to the cause of Italian independence. Italy may now be said to hold her destiny in her own hands, and true honour, as well as true patriotism, should determine them to rely on no other support than that of their own courage, wisdom, and endurance.

ART. VI. — *Revolutions in English History.* By ROBERT VAUGHAN, D. D. Vol. I., *Revolutions of Race.* London, 1859.

THE word 'Revolution' in Dr. Vaughan's title-page, is hardly to be taken in the sense in which it is most familiar. He does not mean by it merely sudden and violent changes of government or dynasty, but he includes also those gradual changes which are constantly going on in the history of every nation. In short, in Dr. Vaughan's sense, every country is in a never-ending state of revolution, and a history of the revolutions of a country is simply equivalent to a history of the country itself. We do not mean that this sense of the word is at all unknown or unjustifiable; we only doubt whether it is that which would first occur to any one on seeing the title of Dr. Vaughan's book. It is therefore not unlikely to give a false notion of Dr. Vaughan's purpose in writing it.

The truth is that Dr. Vaughan has written, or intended to write, a history of England, differing in form only from other histories of England. He tells us himself that it is 'designed 'to serve the purpose for which all such histories are professedly 'written.' That object, as we understand him, is to answer the question—'What is it that has made England to be England?' This means, we suppose, what are the causes which have made England, as it now is, to differ from other countries, as they now are; what, more especially, are those which have made it to differ from countries which, like France and Germany, began their history from a somewhat similar starting point. Dr. Vaughan hopes 'to conduct his reader to satisfactory 'conclusions in relation to this question, by a road much 'more direct and simple than is compatible with the laws 'to which the historian usually conforms himself when writ-'ing the general history of a nation. Our busy age needs 'some assistance of this nature.' Dr. Vaughan, in short, proposes to be a philosophical historian and not a mere narrator. We must confess that a philosophical historian is a personage who always a little alarms us. In this busy age people are sometimes so busy that, in raising a building, they now and then forget to lay the foundation. A philosophical explanation of facts is a very good thing if you have really mastered the facts in the first instance. But facts are excessively stubborn materials, and, however dull and inglorious they may seem to

work upon, it is by no means safe entirely to neglect them. The philosophy of history must never be put in the place of history itself; a commentary is often very interesting and very instructive, but it is of no great value to those who have not carefully read the text.

A good, clear, and not over long answer to the questions propounded — implicitly at least — by Dr. Vaughan, would be one of the most attractive and valuable books in the language, and we do not think that this ground is exactly preoccupied by any existing writer. Mr. Hallam's object had much in common with it, but yet was not precisely the same. A full answer to Dr. Vaughan's question would need a more general and comparative view of different countries than it suited Mr. Hallam's purpose to take. Lord Macaulay throws out some most valuable hints, but they are merely hints, coming in as something incidental and prefatory to his main design. Dr. Vaughan, we are sorry to say, has not so fully succeeded but that somebody may very well try again. His book contains a great deal of really valuable matter. It represents a large amount of reading and reflection, laid out by a thoughtful and, in many respects, judicious man. Dr. Vaughan has both thought independently for himself, and has made a really discerning use of other writers. But his book lies under incurable objections, both as to form and matter. His English composition is neither simple, clear, graphic, nor accurate. The plan of the work also seems to us to be vicious. Such a book as we have supposed would be essentially a commentary upon facts. It would take for granted an accurate knowledge of the facts on the part both of the author and of his readers. Except in the way of clear and graphic summaries, and of occasional illustrative examples, it should not directly narrate at all. Dr. Vaughan, on the other hand, seems to narrate or not, just as it pleases him. In some places he gives us page after page of direct narration, in almost as great detail as a professedly descriptive historian. Upon other periods he gives us many pages of comment without any direct narrative of events, nor can we always discern the causes of these different modes of treating different portions of the subject. And, worse still, we cannot conceal the fact that Dr. Vaughan is utterly careless in matters of detail. Careless, we say, rather than ignorant, because some of Dr. Vaughan's mistakes would literally imply an amount of ignorance which the general character of his book altogether belies. When Dr. Vaughan talks of *Pertinax* being led in triumph by L. Æmilius Paullus, when he converts the famous Bastard of Burgundy into a *Bastard of Normandy*, we cannot stretch our charity so far as

to lay the blame upon the printer. But we do not for a moment suspect Dr. Vaughan of the monstrous ignorance which is literally involved in the expressions. We cannot think that, if a Board of Examiners sate upon him, they would find that he really believes that Pertinax was King of Macedonia, or that Philip the Good kept his court at Rouen. But mistakes like these, and countless others, in names, dates, and all sorts of points of detail, show that Dr. Vaughan allows himself to write in a hasty, confused, and inaccurate manner, which renders him an untrustworthy guide in the smaller matters of fact.

Again, we cannot think that Dr. Vaughan has acted judiciously, either in the prominence which he gives to the very early portions of his subject or in the manner in which he has treated them. To speak the plain truth, the 'British' and 'Roman' periods have very little to do with the subject. They are in strictness not parts of the history of *England* at all; and they have practically very little to do with the question 'What is it that has made England to be England?' With all due respect for our Celtic fellow-countrymen, among whom we presume that Dr. Vaughan himself is to be reckoned, we cannot conceal that they have done very little towards 'making 'England to be England.' Indeed, we could not reasonably expect them to bear much part in that work. The history of the causes which made England to be England is the history of the English nation, and, if we have to go back for that beyond Hengest and Horsa, our inquiries will be much more profitably carried on in Holstein or Angeln than among the Iceni and the Silures. With such a scheme as Dr. Vaughan's, no more was wanted about Britons or Romans than just enough to make the circumstances of the English conquest intelligible. Dr. Vaughan need not have given us long extracts from the Greek and Roman notices of Celtic Britain, nor, least of all, have transcribed — whether from Xenophon or from Mr. Kenrick is not quite clear, — the well-known description of the Phœnician merchant ship in the Œconomicus. But, if he must enter into such subjects, he should at least have treated them in a scholar-like manner, and with some reference to the latest and most competent authorities. Dr. Guest, for example, has thrown more light upon the Teutonic settlements in Britain than any preceding scholar. If he could be persuaded to work up his various detached essays and lectures into one consecutive 'History of the English Conquest of Britain,' it would be a most valuable contribution made to the early history of our nation; but of the labours of the Master of Caius, Dr. Vaughan seems to have made absolutely no use whatever.

The author who deals with a comparatively obscure period of history has this advantage over both his readers and his critics, that mistakes, even of considerable importance, are not so easily detected by the reader, and, if pointed out by the critic, their importance is not so readily appreciated as if they bore upon matters of more recent times. No writer could safely venture upon any very monstrous misstatements in the history of the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries. He may make inferences or add colourings according to his own opinions or prejudices; two writers of opposite views may do this to such an extent that the pictures which they give may hardly seem to represent the same persons or the same events. But if they have any regard to their own reputation, they will relate the main outline of the facts in pretty much the same order, and will not attribute the actions of one leading character to another. But a writer who deals with the tenth or eleventh century is watched by less prying eyes. Yet an historian who fully realises his responsibility will bring as rigid a sense of duty to bear on the obscure period as he would on the well-known one. No man would confound the acts of Mary the wife of James the Second with those of Mary his daughter; because that is a blunder which not only scholars, but the general public, would find out in a moment. It is probably with perfect safety at the hands of most of his readers, that Dr. Vaughan makes an exactly similar confusion between two princesses who were as important in the eleventh century as the two Maries were in the seventeenth, and, thus, takes away the character of a royal lady, of whom, as we know nothing evil, we are bound in charity to suppose everything good. Dr. Vaughan tells us (p. 300.),

'Harold had married Eadgyth, the daughter of Alfgar. But the marriage could hardly have been a happy one. Eadgyth was a woman of great ambition, and unscrupulous in her use of means to gratify her passions.'

Of the happiness or unhappiness of the married life of Harold and Eadgyth we can really say nothing. Possibly the existence of another Eadgyth may have done something to disturb it. But poor Queen Eadgyth's ambition and unscrupulousness exist only in the imagination of Dr. Vaughan. Nothing is clearer than that he has jumbled together Eadgyth the wife of Harold and Eadgyth his sister, the wife of Edward the Confessor, to whom, as she did not scruple to procure the murder of a certain Gospatric, treacherously, in the King's court, and at the holy season of Christmas, all Dr. Vaughan's epithets, and one or two more besides, would attach with perfect fairness.

Again, when Dr. Vaughan says, that King Æthelstan gave 'his daughter Editha in marriage to a Northumbrian named 'Sightric,' (p. 162.) most readers would not perceive the mistake, and might be inclined to think it a very slight one if pointed out. But it really shows an utter oblivion of one of the most remarkable aspects of the age of which he is speaking. Æthelstan had no recorded children, but he had sisters in remarkable abundance. Those sisters shared nearly all the thrones of western Europe, and some of them play an important part in the history of their adopted countries. One of them, Eadgifu, Edgiva, or Ogiva, is familiar to every reader of Sir Francis Palgrave's last volume. Editha or Eadgyth, — we do not know why Dr. Vaughan uses sometimes the Old-English, sometimes the Latin form, — so far from marrying Sihtric, married no less a man than Otho the Great, and was the mother of his unfortunate eldest son. Another sister was, indeed, obliged to condescend to Sihtric's less brilliant Northumbrian royalty, but her name is not recorded in the chronicles.

In names and dates Dr. Vaughan is singularly inaccurate. With regard to less celebrated names, it is always possible that a portion of the blame may rest with the printer. But it implies great carelessness in the writer when misprints of this sort are not diligently corrected. Dr. Vaughan, therefore, and his printer may divide between them the credit of such mistakes as 'Cat*a*line' (p. 11.), 'Cn*e*ius' (p. 44.), *E*tius for Aëtius (p. 118.), 'Bosh*un*' for Bosham (p. 227.) *Treh*eric for Frithric or Frederick (p. 326). As for dates, we are utterly ignorant of Dr. Vaughan's authority for placing the voyage of Himilco in B.C. 360 (p. 5.), rather than at any earlier or later stage of the Carthaginian power. But we know very well that he can have none for saying (p. 136.) that 'in 488 Ceawlin, king of Wessex, 'became Bretwalda,' considering that Ceawlin reigned from 560 to 593, and that in 488 there was no kingdom of Wessex at all. Equally astonishing is it to hear (p. 176.) that Britons and Danes coalesced against Egbert (who died in 836) 'so late as 'the year 900.' Similarly, according to Dr. Vaughan (p. 368.), Waltheof was beheaded 'in less than seven years after the battle of Hastings,' while, according to the Saxon Chronicle, the event did not take place till 1076.

In the ecclesiastical affairs of early times, Dr. Vaughan is especially weak. We do not ask him to admire or appreciate ecclesiastical heroes, but he might be right in his facts about them. Take, for instance, the case of the person who, according to the degree of respect in which he is held by the speaker, is variously spoken of as Thomas à Becket, Becket, Archbishop

Becket, and St. Thomas of Canterbury. We do not wish Dr. Vaughan to fall down and worship him with Mr. 'John Morris, 'Canon of Northampton;' it is even perhaps too much to expect of him to show the judicial equanimity of Dean Milman or the large-hearted sympathies of Dr. Stanley. But he need not have blundered at almost every fact and almost every technical expression. Becket, he tells us, had 'specially four biographers, 'Gervase, Fitzstephen, Robert de Monte, and Hoveden' (p. 393.). Does he actually suppose that these are the four who make up the 'Quadrilogus?' Did he never hear of Garnier, of Edward Grim, or of Herbert of Bosham? As in p. 403. he distinctly says that Becket was 'not of' Norman race,' and as in p. 393. he actually revives the exploded fable of his mother's Saracen origin, we do not know who his 'guides' are or what he may mean by 'following them discreetly.' But nothing is more certain than that Dr. Vaughan, chiefly by blindly following Mr. Sharon Turner, has fallen into several curious mistakes. The labours of Mr. Turner were most useful and praiseworthy in his own generation, but we really thought we had got beyond them by this time. It happens that William Fitzstephen, in his Life of St. Thomas, mentions that his hero became Archdeacon of Canterbury, and that that archdeaconry was the richest 'personatus' in England after the bishopricks and abbeys. Mr. Turner, and after him Dr. Vaughan (p. 393.) says he was 'rewarded with the richest *parsonage* in England,' which in English suggests something totally different from an archdeaconry. More curiously still, three pages further on in Dr. Vaughan's book, the archdeaconry and the 'parsonage' become two different things, both of which the king calls on the Archbishop to resign. The quarrel with William de Eynesford is generalised into a quarrel with 'some lord,' and the fact is concealed that Thomas did absolve him and that William appeared as his friend, at least as his surety, at Northampton. The wicked Worcestershire priest is in p. 400. localised, without authority, 'in Worcester,' and there is something very odd in the arrangement of the tenses, when we read that 'he was charged 'with *seducing* a young woman and with *having murdered* her 'father.' Does Dr. Vaughan suppose that the murder went before the seduction?

With Lanfranc Dr. Vaughan is hardly more lucky than with Becket. Is there anything very wonderful in the following piece of his history?

'When invited to become Archbishop of Canterbury, he delivered all sorts of protests against the appointment; but, as primate of the English Church he was not prepared to relinquish a *vestige* (?) of the

rights or emoluments of that position. All this, and more, may admit of a satisfactory explanation, but the explanations are not given.' (P. 382.)

We should have thought the explanation was one of the commonest facts of human nature. We will give it in Dr. Vaughan's own words a few pages on.

'As commonly happened with men of his (Anselm's) description, the authority which he seemed most reluctant to accept, was an authority of which he was to the last degree jealous, and by no means disposed to resign when it had once been assumed.' (P. 386.)

Little slips with regard to particular dioceses and foundations it might be hardly worth while to rake up, such as (p. 326.) making the dioceses of Dorchester and Lincoln two instead of one. But there is something singularly grotesque in the sententiousness of the following words:

'Harold, though he founded an abbey, had nothing monastic in his nature.' (P. 298.)

That the founders of abbeys, Henry the First and Henry the Second for instance, were, as a general rule, themselves persons of monastic dispositions or given to monastic strictness of life, we confess never occurred to us. But, if Dr. Vaughan was particularly anxious to prove that Harold had nothing monastic in his nature, he might have hit upon the far better argument that Harold did *not* found an abbey. He did indeed build a church at Waltham, but he intrusted it not to monks but to secular priests, which, in the monastic reign of Edward the Confessor, was a fact very well worthy of notice. Waltham did not come into the possession of the regular canons till 1177.

There are other statements of Dr. Vaughan's of which it is hard to say whether they are mistakes or not, because it is almost impossible to extract any meaning from the words. What is meant, for instance, by the '*extravagant ceremony* of Wilfred's 'ordination' (p. 226)? Dr. Vaughan may possibly look upon all ordination as an extravagant ceremony, but we do not see why such a dogma should be specially put forth with regard to the particular case of Wilfred. Again, where Dr. Vaughan is talking of William Longsword, Duke of Normandy (p. 288.), and his son Richard the Fearless, we should simply deny the statement that 'William possessed none of the warlike tendencies 'of his father,' but when the Doctor goes on to tell us that Richard 'in his policy took sides with the French monarchy,' we can neither deny nor affirm, because we have not the slightest notion what he means. Or again what is to be made of such a sentence as the following?

'Canute now became king of England, and two *men of his race*, Harold and Hardicanute, succeeded him in that dignity. The sovereignty then returned to the Saxon line in the person of Edward the Confessor; *and in its next change it passed to the Norman line, through Harold.*' (P. 173.)

'Men of his race' is, we suppose, a roundabout way of saying 'sons;' but the last paragraph is quite beyond us. How anything could 'pass to the Norman line through Harold' is altogether inexplicable. Again, when describing the ecclesiastical results of the Norman Conquest, Dr. Vaughan tells us (p. 326.),

'By the new clergy the monks were generally expelled from their ancient homes near the cathedrals.'

We have read this sentence several times, and we really do not know what it means. On the whole, we should have thought the Norman Conquest was favourable to the interests of monasticism. We know as little what he means by saying (p. 392.) that 'these monastic brotherhoods were *British* subjects.' 'British subjects,' in the time of Henry the Second, of which Dr. Vaughan is speaking, if it meant anything, would mean subjects of Prince Rhys of Wales. And can a 'brotherhood' be called 'a subject?' Equally mysterious is the elevation of Ivo de Taillebois to the peerage (p. 332.) by the title of 'Viscount 'Spalding,' for which one might almost look among the creations of last year. Is it possible that Dr. Vaughan does not know the meaning of the word 'Vicecomes'?

In short, it was a very great mistake when Dr. Vaughan undertook to describe the period of the Norman Conquest in such full detail. We can see no good reason why he should once more fight the field of Hastings, so often fought already by historians, novelists, and poets. Still less was he bound to do the like by the fight of Stamford-bridge, where the details are wholly mythical and rest on no contemporary evidence. But, at any rate, if Dr. Vaughan thought it his duty to rewrite the history of this most stirring period, he might have attempted to give, not a graphic narrative, in which he would unavoidably have failed, but, at all events, an accurate one. Yet it is in this part of the history that we find the greatest abundance of slips in names, dates, and minor facts. Most of them we are willing to attribute to nothing worse (though that is bad enough) than a careless and slovenly way of writing. But, whenever we get beyond the *quatuor maria* of this isle of Britain, we think we discern signs not merely of inadvertence, but of ignorance.

Of Dr. Vaughan's apparent ignorance of foreign matters we

will confine ourselves to two or three instances, some of which will illustrate a curious, but certainly pardonable habit of the Doctor's; that, namely, of correcting his own mistakes, sometimes in the same paragraph, sometimes a page or two after.

'The Moslems of Spain were in possession of all the *Greek literature and science* that had survived the fall of the Roman Empire. The light diffused from their many noble libraries, and their many seats of learning, had placed them far in advance of the Christian states of Europe. But the time had come in which the nations of the West were to share largely in those treasures. The most valuable Greek authors were translated into Latin, and passed with profuse Latin commentaries over the whole of Christendom. By Moslem and by Christian, however, it was not so much the literature, as the science of the ancient world, that was especially prized, mathematics, astronomy, chemistry, and medicine, together with metaphysics, logic, and rhetoric — these were the favourite studies. The study of the Roman and Canon Laws was of course, peculiar to the Christian states. (P. 327.)

The plain fact is that, while the Saracens cultivated Greek philosophy with much diligence and success, they were so far from having a monopoly of Greek *literature*, that of the Greek poets, orators, and historians they appear to have been altogether ignorant. From any place 'among the most valuable Greek 'authors' Dr. Vaughan implicitly excludes Homer, Thucydides, and Demosthenes. Before he had got to the end of his paragraph he found out his mistake; but he did not alter what he had already written. We quote this passage also for another reason as an instance of the way in which people coolly ignore the existence of Eastern Christendom. No one would for a moment infer from Dr. Vaughan's account that, whatever the Moslems knew either of Greek literature or of Greek science, they derived from the despised 'Greeks of the Lower Empire.' No one would think for a moment that, while the West, Moslem and Christian, was painfully toiling at Arabic and Latin translations, Aristotle still possessed students who read him in his own tongue, for the simple reason that his tongue was also theirs.

We must quote another exploit of Dr. Vaughan's in a similar field. There is, perhaps, only one moment when English and Byzantine history come into contact. Let us see what Dr. Vaughan makes of it. During the reign of William the Conqueror —

'Many of the more warlike among the English now fled westward and emigrated from the ports of Wales to the Continent with their arms in their hands, soliciting help for their country or offering their services to foreign princes. One body of such men, under the com-

mand of Siward, a soldier of reputation in Gloucestershire, extended their travels as far as *Sicily, where they were enrolled in the army of the Emperor Alexis*, under the name of the *axe-bearers*.

'It happened too, that when the Normans, under Robert Guiscard, invaded the neighbouring province of Apulia, these English axe-bearers were the men in the front of the imperial army to meet them. The Englishmen made good use of the occasion. Guiscard was defeated, and the Emperor built a town *in Ionia* for the accommodation of his Anglo-Saxon auxiliaries. Subsequently, Alexis "recalled them "to the imperial city, and committed to their charge his principal "palace, and his royal treasure. In this way the Anglo-Saxons settled "in Ionia, they and their posterity becoming faithfully attached to "the Holy Empire, and having gained great honour in Thrace, con-"tinue," says Ordericus, "to the present day beloved by the emperor, "senate, and people." ' (P. 324.)

Let us suppose a reader, who, as a wise man should, neither neglects the present for the sake of the past, nor despises the past in his zeal for the present. He may naturally ask, which is Dr. Vaughan's 'Ionia'? Where was it that our countrymen so distinguished themselves? Was it in the parts of Ephesus and Miletus, or in those of Corfu and Cephalonia? Now it is perfectly true that Orderic* speaks of the English exiles going to 'Ionia,' but also nothing can possibly be plainer than that by 'Ionia' he meant nothing in the world but *Greece*—Greece, that is in a wide sense, including the whole Byzantine Empire. He calls Greece 'Ionia,' in the same style of affectation which makes him go on to call the Greeks of the time of Alexius 'Danai,' 'Thraces,' and 'Pelasgi,' just as Liudprand thought it very striking and elegant to call the Greeks of the time of Nicephorus Phocas, 'Argivi,' and Constantinople itself, 'Argos.' Dr. Vaughan does very right to retain the word 'Ionia' when he is actually translating from Orderic, but surely not when he is speaking in his own person. Moreover the town built by Alexius, 'Chevetot,' or Cibotus, on or near the site of the ancient Cios, is, unluckily, in the geography of Herodotus and Xenophon, placed not in 'Ionia,' but in Mysia. Moreover it is without any authority from Orderic that Dr. Vaughan carries the English exiles into Sicily, where he plants also a purely mythical Byzantine army. With him also Apulia is a Byzantine province invaded by Robert, while, in Orderic, Robert is already its acknowledged duke. In short, Dr. Vaughan has not the slightest notion that the Byzantine Empire had already lost all its Italian possessions, and that Robert had actually carried the war east of the Adriatic. To have learned better would not have called for any more pro-

* Lib. iv. p. 508. Duchesne.

found research than a reference to Gibbon, or one would have thought that Dr. Vaughan might have found it out from the very passage of Orderic which he was translating.

One instance more we must give, as showing an utter confusion of the very alphabet of general European history. We should at least have expected Dr. Vaughan to have had some general notion of the great struggle for Investiture. But what are we to make of such a passage as the following? —

'But the controversy which grew up in this way between Anselm and Henry, had become a European controversy. It had provoked the most angry discussions, especially in Germany, where circumstances seemed to point to the Emperor as the most fitting person to sustain the rights of the civil power against this new form of assault upon it. The ceremony itself in this case was clearly a very trivial matter, but the interpretation put upon it by the court of Rome, and the uses to which it might be applied, were not trivial.' (P. 388.)

Is it possible that Dr. Vaughan believes that the great warfare of Pope and Cæsar, which for two centuries shook Europe to its centre, really grew out of a quarrel between a king of England and an archbishop of Canterbury? In the very next page he goes on to discuss the policy of 'the far-seeing Gre-'gory VII.' Is it possible that he believes that he was contemporary with, or later than, the dispute between Anselm and Henry? With this difficulty before us, we cannot stop to ask whom, in Germany, except the Emperor, Dr. Vaughan would have expected to be 'the most fitting person to sustain the 'rights of the civil power.'

Thus much for positive mistakes, though we might easily enumerate more, if our space and our readers' patience would allow. But we cannot help mentioning a cavil which Dr. Vaughan has most needlessly raised against the great writer whose recent loss historical literature still deplores. Dr. Vaughan brings a charge against Lord Macaulay of underrating the British and Anglo-Saxon periods of our history. We cannot see that Lord Macaulay did anything of the kind. He said little about them, simply because they did not form part of his subject. The British period, indeed, we can believe that Lord Macaulay, or indeed any English writer, might seem to depreciate in the eyes of an enthusiastic Welshman. But on any depreciation of our own Teutonic fathers we should ourselves look with considerable jealousy, and we cannot see that Lord Macaulay is fairly open to the charge. Dr. Vaughan forgets that Lord Macaulay did not undertake to begin his history with Brute or even with Hengest, but only with James II., and that all that he says of earlier times is simply by way of prefatory sketch. The main

object of that sketch was to trace the ever-advancing struggle of the English people from the time when our laws and constitution assumed something like their existing shape, from the days, in short, when our history ceases to be the domain of antiquaries and becomes the domain of lawyers. As that period dates long after the days of Æthelberht or Alfred, it implies no sort of depreciation of them on Lord Macaulay's part that he says but little about them. The little which it fell in with his purpose to say, is certainly written in anything but a depreciatory tone. But how well qualified Dr. Vaughan is to criticise Lord Macaulay, we may see by the following specimen:—

'Lord Macaulay further states that such was the contempt with which the English were regarded by the Normans, that, when Henry I. hoped to gain the affections of the natives by marrying an English princess, the marriage was regarded by many of the barons as a marriage between a white planter and a quadroon girl would now be regarded in Virginia. (Vol. i. p. 19.) Is it not strange then, that the Norman writers should tell us that William himself, the m[illegible] of all those barons, betrothed one of his daughters to that quadroon Harold, son of Earl Godwin; another to that quadroon Edwin, son of Earl Alfgar; and that he gave his niece Judith in marriage to that quadroon Waltheof, son of Earl Siward? Did the taint run in the blood of the one sex and not in the other? It would hardly seem to be so, for a sister of this quadroon princess became the wife of one of those haughty barons; and marriages between the two races were only too common for the happiness of Anglo-Saxon females of good family, whose lot was cast in those evil times. 'In more than one instance a Norman princess was not thought to be degraded by being given in marriage even to a Welshman.' (P. 343.)

Now we freely allow that in this expression of Lord Macaulay's, as in many others, there is a certain amount of exaggeration. There is no doubt that Henry's marriage with Matilda was looked on by the Normans as something degrading. The odd thing is that Normans and English alike seem to have looked on the daughter of the King of Scots as if she had been purely English. But we do not believe that the degradation was looked on as so great as the marriage of a Virginian planter with a quadroon girl would now be. But the exaggeration, like many others of Lord Macaulay's forcible illustrations, is an exaggeration in form only, and not in effect. It very often happens that an exact statement of the truth conveys to the reader less than the truth; and that if the writer wishes his reader to carry away the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, he must himself state something a little beyond the truth. The forcible expression sticks to the memory, and the reason silently makes the needful deduction. Had Lord Macaulay merely said that Marlborough

was an avaricious man, the great mass of his readers would have forgotten the fact. But when they read of his drawers full of untouched broad pieces, and of the pain given him by the loss of half a guinea, nobody takes these illustrations literally, but everybody remembers that Marlborough really was an avaricious man. So, too, a dry statement that the Normans despised the English, would make no impression; but the illustration of the quadroon, exaggerated as it is, is sure to be remembered, and the needful deduction is almost mechanically made. But, anyhow, Dr. Vaughan's criticism is absurd. Whether the Normans despised the English much or little, they despised them because they were a subject race. No such feeling could exist before they had seen Englishmen in the relation of subjects. Dr. Vaughan's instances (save perhaps the Norman princesses (?) marrying Welshmen, of whom we should like to know something more) belong either to the days before the Conquest, when Norman and Englishman met on terms of equality, or else to the time when the Conquest was still imperfect, and while William still courted the goodwill of his English subjects. Supposing the Norman barons did look upon Queen Matilda as a 'quadroon,' it would by no means follow that their fathers had so looked upon Earl Harold when he fought and conquered side by side with their duke in the Breton war. We only wish we had no heavier charges to bring against Dr. Vaughan than he has to bring against Lord Macaulay.

We are sorry to have to point out so many important blemishes in Dr. Vaughan's book, because there really is much sterling excellence in it. As he advances in his subject, he gives us less of narration, and his mistakes consequently lie less thick on the ground. His general views are sometimes original, and almost always sensible and independent. A reader who is sufficiently master of English history to correct Dr. Vaughan's details as he goes along, may read many portions of his book with great profit. Some parts will act as a useful summary, and others will suggest matter for original reflection. It is much to be regretted that a writer who has so much of sound stuff in him as Dr. Vaughan, should have allowed himself to fall into habits of loose and unscholarlike writing. It is one of the commonest faults of the present day, the natural result of the prevalent superficial fashion of historical study. Men get hold of some philosophical historian, some putter forth of 'views' and theories, sound or unsound as it may happen, but which in either case they have not themselves tested. These views and theories are so attractive, that they come to be looked on as a royal road to history; and the drudgery of chronicles and charters, of

names and dates and facts, is despised as something quite unworthy of a philosopher. We debate about causes and principles, till we forget that, after all, no test is so certain as the simple process of weighing our fish and our bucket. History gets looked upon as something so pretty and so easy, as to be within the reach of every one. Every holiday traveller, every writer of leading articles, gives us his historical sketches and historical summaries, in the happy assurance that the 'general 'reader' will never distinguish the facts from the blunders. In the small fry of literature this is no more than we should expect, but it is a more serious matter when the prevalent vice attacks a writer, who, like Dr. Vaughan, is in many respects sensible and judicious, and whom certainly no one would ever accuse of the sin of flippancy. He never seems able to conceive or convey a clear idea of details. For our readers will have seen that almost all the faults we have found are faults of detail. We have not objected, because we have little reason to object, to anything strictly to be called opinion or argument. One important exception indeed we must make. Through his whole work, Dr. Vaughan carries with him one class of incurable prejudices, which hinder him from ever doing full justice to any churchman.

The earlier part of Dr. Vaughan's book we look upon as altogether a mistake. His British and Roman periods were not wanted at all; his Anglo-Saxon period is crowded with errors; in the period of the Norman Conquest he seems to have been led away by two great writers, each of them admirable in his own way, but who are the very worst models for such a man as Dr. Vaughan. Like so many other writers, he has been deceived by the matchless fascination of Thierry. In some places indeed we see something like actual imitation of so dangerous a model. Thierry, as we said in a former article *, always clearly sees and eloquently sets forth one side of the case, just as Sir Francis Palgrave clearly sees and eloquently sets forth the other. Nor is Thierry at all void of a certain accuracy, or attempt at accuracy, in detail. It is not indeed the calm and judicial accuracy, the result of evidence weighed against evidence, which we are used to in Bishop Thirlwall. But it is something at least as widely removed from the mere blundering and invention of the Oxford oracle, David Hume. Thierry never writes purely out of his own head; he colours indeed more than any other historian; but he has something like authority to quote for every direct assertion. But one authority

* Edinburgh Review, April, 1859.

with him is just as good as another. Any statement likely to patch up his theory or to heighten his picture, is at once accepted, provided only it is found in some author who wrote before the invention of printing. A good deal of what we say of Thierry is also true of his rival Sir Francis. Both of them have clearly exercised a great influence upon Dr. Vaughan. But it is clear that they have been to him little more than brilliant meteors leading him astray. When he gets into later periods he is in safer hands. There Dr. Lingard and Mr. Hallam reign supreme. Mr. Hallam never led any man wrong; and the way in which Dr. Lingard might lead some minds wrong is one against which Dr. Vaughan was so well forearmed as to be in little danger.

The latter part then of Dr. Vaughan's book we accept as, on the whole, a sound and clear summary of the political and social progress of Plantagenet England. Slips in detail do indeed still occasionally occur, but we can with a good conscience set the seal of our approbation to most of his general views. We might perhaps have wished to see his great question, 'How 'England became England' better illustrated by comparison with the diverging destinies of France and Germany. But it is clear that Dr. Vaughan's studies have not lain in that direction. Where, however, we find so much sterling merit as in this part of Dr. Vaughan's book we are not disposed to dwell harshly upon a fault which is merely one of deficiency and not of inaccuracy. The comparison indeed of the three great nations of England, France, and Germany would be a subject for a distinct article, or rather for a distinct book, and we can do no more than glance at it here. One important aspect of it we shall have occasion briefly to recur to.

We think that Dr. Vaughan fully understands, though the form of his book does not allow him to put it forth so fully as might be wished, the point at which the line between the past and the present in English history may with greatest truth be drawn. It is not to be drawn at the point where a superficial glance might perhaps induce us to draw it, at the Norman invasion in 1066. At first sight that event might seem to separate us from all before it in a way to which there is no analogy in the history either of our own or of kindred lands. Neither France nor Germany ever saw any event to be compared to the Norman Conquest. Neither of them has ever received a permanent dynasty of foreign kings, or has seen its lands divided among the soldiers of a foreign army, and its native sons excluded from every position of wealth or dignity. England, alone of the three, has undergone a real and permanent

foreign conquest. One might have expected that the greatest of all possible historical chasms would have divided the ages before and the ages after such an event. Yet in truth modern England has practically far more to do with the England of the West-Saxon kings than modern France or Germany has with the France of Charles the Great, or even of much more recent times. The England of the age before the Norman Conquest is indeed, in all external respects, widely removed from us. But the England of the age immediately succeeding the Norman Conquest is something more widely removed still. The age when Englishmen dwelt in their own land as a conquered race, when their name and tongue were badges of contempt and slavery, when England was counted for little more than an accession of power to the Duke of Rouen in his struggle with the King of Paris, is an age than which we can conceive none more alien to every feeling and circumstance of our own. When then did the England in which we still live and move have its beginning? Where are we to draw the broad line, if any line is to be drawn, between the present and the past? We answer in the great creative and destructive age of Europe and of civilised Asia—the thirteenth century. The England of Richard Cœur-de-Lion is an England which is past for ever; but the England of Edward the First is essentially the still living England in which we have our own being. Up to the thirteenth century, as we before said, our history is the domain of antiquaries; from that point it becomes the domain of lawyers. A law of King Alfred's Witenagemot is a valuable link in the chain of our political progress, but it could not have been alleged as any legal authority by the accusers of Strafford or the defenders of the Seven Bishops. A statute of Edward the First is quite another matter. Unless it can be shown to have been repealed by another statute, it is just as good to this day as a statute of Queen Victoria. In the earlier period we may indeed trace the rudiments of our laws, our language, our political institutions; but from the thirteenth century onwards we see the things themselves, in that very essence which we all agree in wishing to retain, though successive generations have wrought improvement in many points of detail and may have left many others capable of farther improvement still. Let us illustrate our meaning by the greatest of all examples. Since the first Teutonic settlers landed on her shores, England has never known full and complete submission to a single will. Some assembly, Witenagemot, Great Council, or Parliament, there has always been, capable of checking the caprices of tyrants and of speaking, with more or less of right, in the name

of the nation. From Hengest to Victoria England has always had what we may fairly call a parliamentary constitution. Normans, Tudors, and Stuarts might suspend or weaken it, but they could not wholly sweep it away. Our Old-English Witenagemots, our Norman Great Councils, are matters of antiquarian research, whose exact constitution it puzzles our best antiquaries fully to explain. But from the thirteenth century onwards we have a veritable parliament, essentially as we see it before our own eyes. In the course of the fourteenth century every fundamental constitutional principle becomes fully recognised. The best worthies of the seventeenth century struggled not for the establishment of anything new, but for the preservation of what even then was already old. It is on the Great Charter that we still rest the foundation of all our rights. And no later parliamentary reformer has ever carried or proposed so vast a change as when Simon de Montfort, by a single writ, conferred parliamentary existence upon the cities and boroughs of England.

The successive chapters of the last half of Dr. Vaughan's book, bring out many of the points of progress from the thirteenth century onward with great truth, and they form, in every respect, a favourable contrast to the irrelevance and inaccuracy of those which go before them. His sketches of political life are well worth reading. When he gets into the elegancies of life, he is less successful, and his talk, not uncommon, about architectural matters is worthy rather of the eighteenth than of the nineteenth century. But on the whole, he works out well in detail the general principle, which is really the theme of Lord Macaulay's prefatory sketch, and the primary text of his main narration; the continuity of English history from the thirteenth century onwards. At the time of the Conquest, the many small Teutonic kingdoms in Britain had grown into the one united Teutonic realm of England, rich in her barbaric greatness and barbaric freedom, with the germs, but as yet only the germs, of every institution which we most dearly prize. At the close of the thirteenth century, we see the England, with which we are still familiar, young indeed and tender, but still possessing more than the germs, the very things themselves. She has already King, Lords, and Commons; she has a king mighty indeed and honoured, but who may neither ordain laws, nor impose taxes against the will of his people. She has lords with high hereditary powers, but lords who are still only the foremost rank of the people, whose children sink into the general mass of Englishmen, and into whose order any Englishman may be raised. She has a com-

monalty still diffident in the exercise of new-born rights; but a commonalty whose constitution and whose powers we have altered only by gradual changes of detail; commons, who, if they sometimes shrank from hard questions of state, were at least resolved that no man should take their money without their leave. The courts of justice, the great offices of state, the chief features of local administration, have assumed, or are rapidly assuming, the form whose essential character they still retain. The struggle with Papal Rome has already begun; doctrines and ceremonies, indeed, remain as yet unchallenged, but statute after statute is passed to restrain the abuses and exactions of the ever odious Roman court. The great middle class of England is rapidly forming; a middle class not, as elsewhere, confined to a few great cities, but spread, in the form of a minor gentry and a wealthy yeomanry, over the whole face of the land. Villainage still exists, but both law and custom are paving the way for that gradual and silent extinction of it, which, without any formal abolition of the legal status, left, three centuries later, not a legal villain among us. With this exception, there was in theory equal law for all classes, and imperfectly as the theory may have been carried out, it was at least far less imperfectly so than in any other kingdom. Our language was rapidly forming; English, in the main intelligible at the present day, was the speech of the mass of the people, and was soon to expel French from the halls of princes and nobles. England, at the close of the century, is for the first time since the Conquest, ruled by a prince bearing a purely English name, and following a purely English policy. Edward the First was no doubt as despotic as he could be or dared to be; so was every prince of those days who could not practise the superhuman righteousness of St. Lewis. But he ruled over a people who knew how to keep even his despotism within bounds. The legislator of England, the conqueror of Wales and Scotland, seems truly like an old Bretwalda or West-Saxon Basileus sitting once more on the throne of Cerdic and of Alfred. The modern English nation is now formed; it stands ready for those struggles for French dominion in the two following centuries, which, utterly unjust and fruitless as they were, still proved indirectly the confirmation of our liberties at home, and which for ever fixed the national character for good and for evil.

In comparing England with France and Germany, the great point of distinction is the thorough continuity of English history and institutions. As we before said, our modern Parliament is traced up in an unbroken line to the early Great

Council, and to the still earlier Witênagemot. The later institution, widely different as it is from the earlier, has not been substituted for the earlier, but has grown out of it. It would be ludicrous to look for any such continuity between the diet of ambassadors which meets at Frankfort, and the assemblies which met to obey Henry the Third, and to depose Henry the Fourth. And how stands the case in France? France has tried constitutional government in all its shapes; in its old Teutonic, in its mediæval, and in all its modern forms — Kings with one Chamber and Kings with two, Republics without Presidents and Republics with, Conventions, Directories, Consulates, and Empires. All of these have been separate experiments; all have failed; there is no historical continuity between any of them. Charles the Great gathered his Great Council around him year by year; his successors in Eastern France, the Kings of the Teutonic Kingdom, continued to do so long afterwards. But in Gaul, in Western France, after it fell away from the common centre, no such assembly could be gathered together. The kingdom split into fragments; every province did what was right in its own eyes; Aquitaine and Toulouse had neither fear nor love enough for their nominal king to contribute any members to a council of his summoning. Philip the Fair, for his own convenience, summoned the States-General. But the States-General were no historical continuation of the old Frankish Assemblies; they were a new institution of his own, devised, it may be, in imitation of the English Parliament or of the Spanish Cortes. From that time the French States-General ran a brilliant and a fitful course. Very different indeed were they from the homely Parliaments of England. Our stout knights and citizens seem to have been altogether guiltless of political theories. They had no longing after great and comprehensive measures. But if they saw any practical abuses in the land, the king could get no money out of them till he set matters right again. If they saw a bad law, they demanded its alteration; if they saw a wicked minister, they demanded his dismissal. It is this sort of bit-by-bit reform, going on for six hundred years, which has saved us alike from magnificent theories, and from massacres in the cause of humanity. Both were as familiar in France in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as ever they were at the close of the eighteenth. The demands of the States-General, and of what we may call the liberal party in France generally, throughout those two centuries, are as wide in their extent, and as neatly expressed, as any modern constitution from 1791 to 1848. But while the English Parliament, meeting year after year, made almost every year some

small addition or other to the mass of our liberties, the States-General, meeting only now and then, effected nothing permanent, and gradually sank into as complete disuse as the old Frankish Assemblies. By the time of the revolution of 1789, their constitution and mode of proceeding had become matters of antiquarian curiosity. Of later attempts, National Assemblies, National Conventions, Chambers of Deputies, we need not speak. They have risen, and they have fallen, while the House of Lords and the House of Commons have gone on undisturbed.

And as with the parliamentary constitution, so it is with all our lesser institutions. There is hardly a title or office, from a lord chancellor to a head-borough, which does not reach back at least to Edward the First, while not a few reach back to Alfred and Hengest. What would Philip the Fair have understood by a prefect of a department? what by a minister of public instruction? But Edward the First corresponded with the sheriffs of his counties, with the mayor and aldermen of his capital, exactly like our present sovereign. Elsewhere, the advisers of the Crown bear some title which at once bespeaks their modern origin. Here in England they are sometimes the shadows, sometimes the realities, of some great mediæval office. On the other side of the Channel, the minister bears his portfolio, here the secretary bears his seal. Look again at our local divisions. Save for the addition of the Welsh counties, the map of England under Victoria is exactly the same as the map of England under William the Conqueror, we might almost say, as the map of England under Alfred. Of the old English kingdoms, several still survive as counties, some of them with their boundaries absolutely unchanged. And all the other shires date from a period so remote, that no man can point to the time or author of their division. But a map of France or Germany sixty or seventy years old, is already well nigh useless; one showing those countries as they stood under Barbarossa or Louis VII. looks like the map of another region. Normandy, Burgundy, Guienne, are gone,—cut up into departments which we suppose only their own prefects can undertake to remember. In the other of the old Frankish realms, where are the old Five Nations? where are the comparatively modern Seven Electors? Franconia, Saxony, Lorraine, Bavaria, and Swabia, have either vanished from the map, or have so changed their shapes and boundaries, that no man would recognise them for the same. In everything, in laws, in institutions, in local divisions, France and Germany have been alike lands of change, England is pre-eminently the land of permanence.

But though the characteristics of English history are thus

throughout combined permanence and progress, yet we cannot deny that there are occasional periods of at least apparent retrogression. We say apparent, because it may be doubted whether there has been any period which has proved to be such in the long run. One such period we have already seen; the period of Norman oppression comes between the days of England's earlier and later freedom. Yet, even during that gloomy twelfth century, the silent union of the two nations must have been going on, without which England could never have beheld the glorious events of the thirteenth. So at a later period, Dr. Vaughan is perfectly correct in calling the reign of Edward the Third, 'the brightest period of our middle age life,' and in speaking of the fifteenth century as a comparatively degenerate time. The biographer of Wickliffe is indeed chiefly thinking of the persecutions of the Lollards, but he does not forget to bring out the political aspect of the case also. In many respects, the fifteenth century was a degenerate time. Some good laws were made, some good precedents were established; but, on the whole, the parliaments of the fifteenth century were less liberal and independent bodies than those of the fourteenth. One of them stands alone in English History in passing a counter-reform bill. The county franchise was restricted to those freeholders whose possessions reached the amount of forty shillings yearly. Considering the then value of money, this must have been at the time a measure of extraordinary exclusiveness, such as the most conservative of statesmen would not have dreamed of for some generations past. The later parliaments of this century exhibit the most utter subserviency to the powers which are uppermost for the moment; we feel that we are fast drawing near to the Elysian epoch of Mr. Froude. Again, the war with France has sunk into a mere struggle for an unjust dominion, and is succeeded by fierce and purposeless civil wars at home. The personal and dynastic struggles of the fifteenth century excite a sort of feeling of disgust when compared with the great struggles of principle either of the thirteenth century or of the seventeenth. Yet there is a bright side even to the fifteenth century. That age, looked at alone, may be thought to have gone back, but in the long run, it has, like other ages, contributed to our general progress. The development of the popular power in the seventeenth century required the previous breaking down of the old feudal nobility. The general harmony between the two houses of Parliament, from their very beginning, has been something wonderful; but it is evident that, till the old nobles were got out of the way, the House of Commons could not have become the real ruling body. And the particular way in which

it was done, prevented any open breach between the mass of the people and a peerage which was really the first rank among themselves. The Norman nobility were not overthrown by any popular movement; they were cut down by each others' swords at Towton and Barnet, or were reserved to fall beneath the axe of Henry. The Tudor despotism, like the Norman despotism, may have served to shelter and preserve the elements of liberty through a period of transition. And if the parliaments of the later Plantagenet era were less independent than their predecessors, we see, both then and in the Tudor age, abundant evidence that the importance of Parliament was becoming more and more fully recognised. The very act which restricted the elective franchise, shows that the elective franchise was a thing valued and sought after, and no longer felt as a burthen, as it seems often to have been in earlier times. Late in the fifteenth century, as the Paston Letters show, the position of a borough member had risen sufficiently to be an object of ambition to men of birth and landed property. In the Tudor age, we come to direct government interference at elections, and to the creation of insignificant boroughs on purpose to secure members in the interest of the Crown. Violent and corrupt as were these stretches of power, they still show the advancing importance of the body about whose composition so much care was taken. And palpably unjust as were the wars in France of this age, they were more distinctly national wars, waged for the national glory. Edward the Third, as a French prince, claimed the crown of France; his son reigned at Bordeaux as Prince of Aquitaine. But Henry the Fifth, as a King of England, obtained a treaty, which made the crown of France an appendage to the crown of England. Doubtless England, by grasping at that French crown, lost her own Aquitanian coronet, but that very loss rendered her still more insular and national, and it is clear that all traces of the old Norman feeling must have utterly died out in the breasts of the men who strove to make France a province of England.

In that particular aspect of the fifteenth century which is most interesting to Dr. Vaughan, we see the same mixture of advance and retrogression. The Church of the fifteenth century was scandalously corrupt; both doctrinal and practical abuses had reached their highest pitch. The prelates of that day were, at all events in their professional aspect, men very inferior to their predecessors. They had sunk into mere secular statesmen, members of noble families who preferred the crosier to the sword, and whose ecclesiastical advancement was owing to their birth or their worldly services. The fifteenth century

supplies us with none of the saints, heroes, and patriots of the Church; the Anselms and Beckets, the Langtons and Grossetestes of former times. Chichele was one of the best prelates of that day, and certainly owed his promotion to merit in his own calling. But even Chichele was not ashamed to promote an unjust war, in order to draw off the attention of the king and the nation from the overgrown wealth of the Church. But, on the other hand, even this degradation of the Church is not without its good side also. The Church is no longer antagonistic to the State, the clergy have become citizens like other men.

When we began, we spoke of Dr. Vaughan as one who aimed at the character of a philosophical historian. By this we mean that he professes not to be a mere narrator, but one who strives to follow out causes in their effects. There is, however, a philosophy of history to which he has not attained, and which we certainly do not blame him for not attaining. We have traced out, to a considerable extent under his guidance, the outward sequence of cause and effect through a considerable portion of history. This outward sequence is all that Dr. Vaughan professes to trace out, and it is all that we can profess to trace out either. We cannot submit the phenomena of English history, its course at home, or its points of difference from that of other nations, to any grand scientific law. If we are asked for the causes of the contrast between the steady course of freedom in England and its fitful rises and falls in France, we have no universal formula of explanation. We can only say that the causes are many and various: and some of those which we should assign are perhaps rather of an old-fashioned kind. We confess that we are not up to the last lights of the age; we have not graduated in the school of Mr. Buckle. We still retain our faith in the existence and the free-will both of God and of man. National character, geographical position, earlier historical events, have had much to do with the difference; but we believe that the personal character of individual men, and the happy thought, or happy accident, of some particular enactment has often had quite as much to do with it as any of them. Our whole political development has surely been more effectually and more beneficially influenced by no one single cause than by that law or custom which gives to the children of a peer no higher legal status than that of simple commoners. This alone has allowed us to retain the institution of a hereditary peerage, while it has delivered us from the curse of a nobility of the continental sort, forming a distinct caste from the rest of the people. Yet no one can tell the date, the author, or the

cause of this all-important rule. Again, we do not believe that men like William the Conqueror and Edward the First were mere walking automata. Their personal will, their personal genius, did influence men and things, let philosophers say what they please. Of these several classes of causes we have only space to point out a few of the most important. None, we think, has been more so than the fact that we Englishmen live in an island, and have always moved in a sort of world of our own. This, combined with the exterminating character of the first Teutonic settlements, made Anglo-Saxon England a more purely Teutonic country than even Germany itself. And even the Norman Conquest, which seemed to destroy, in truth only strengthened the old Teutonic life of the nation. To that event, more than to any other, we owe the new birth of freedom two centuries later. The Norman Conquest gave the finishing stroke to that process of union which had been going on ever since the days of Egbert. England now became for ever one kingdom. For a moment she became the prey of strangers; but a variety of happy circumstances soon tended to convert her conquerors into her children. The gigantic genius and iron will of the Conqueror himself enabled him to establish a power in the crown which had no parallel in Europe save at Constantinople and at Cordova. Then came the accession of the Plantagenets, which was almost equivalent to a second Conquest. The French domains of Henry the Second were so vast that he was essentially a French sovereign. William was a Norman reigning in England; Englishmen were slaves, but England was great. Henry was a Duke of Normandy and Aquitaine, a would-be King of France, who ruled England as a transmarine dependency. Almost every station of dignity was given, not only not to men of old English blood, but not even to the descendants of the first Norman settlers; men, utter strangers to the land, held sway over both. In the reign of John the strictly French provinces were lost; Aquitaine alone was retained, a country as foreign to France as to England, and which found her account in loyalty to the more distant master. Then came fresh swarms of foreigners under Henry the Third, when at last the nation was ready for resistance. All these causes had combined to draw all the natives of the soil together. The heavy hand of despotism pressed alike upon the conqueror and the conquered. Men alien to the realm were enriched and exalted at the expense of both. The Norman, meanwhile, had drunk in the air of the free island, and had learned that the laws of good King Edward were as good for him as for his English neighbour. He soon found that his true place was

beside the English people, not beside the foreign king. Rapidly did the Norman lords and gentlemen adopt the name, the feelings, and at last the tongue of Englishmen. The bloody baptism of Lewes and of Evesham made the two races brethren in war and in peace for ever. In short, the true effect of the Norman Conquest was not to crush or extinguish the old English spirit, but to call it out in a more definite and antagonistic form, and to give it a band of proselytes in the conquering Normans themselves.

Thus did an event which seemed to be the very death of English freedom prove in the end to be to it, above all others, a savour of life unto life. We will not speculate as to what might have been, had William, instead of Harold, fallen upon the hill of Senlac. It is enough to see what has been; that it is, more than to any other one cause, owing to the very event which might have seemed to cut off England for ever from her ancient being, that she has been enabled in very truth, to preserve an uninterrupted historical continuity with her earliest days which has been denied to kindred nations which never went through her fiery trial.*

We have wandered somewhat far from Dr. Vaughan. But we have certainly had him throughout before our mind, and the train of thought into which we have been led is fairly and naturally suggested by the better portions of his volume. For such suggestions we heartily thank him, and we only regret that much agreement with and admiration of his general views has been somewhat marred, in the righteous exercise of the critic's sterner duties, by pointing out the instances of singular carelessness which disfigure his book in matters of detail. Dr. Vaughan is far better calculated for an essayist than for a narrator; for the latter office he has neither the necessary vivacity nor the necessary habit of minute accuracy, while the sound and practical character of his general views eminently qualify him for the work of an historical commentator.

* On the general results of the Norman Conquest some good remarks will be found in M. Emile de Bonnechose's 'Quatre Conquêtes 'de l'Angleterre.' This work seems written to a great extent in answer to Thierry, with whom the author often grapples very successfully. With nothing at all like Thierry's graphic power, he brings a far sounder historical judgment to his task. In this, as well as in his other historical publications, M. de Bonnechose has rendered a service both to this country and to the rest of Europe, by placing a sensible manual of English history within the reach of French readers.

ART. VII.—*Memoir of the Life of Ary Scheffer.* By Mrs. GROTE. London: 1860.

THE works of Ary Scheffer do not owe the high place they justly fill in the modern schools of painting, either to masterly force and accuracy of design, in which he was surpassed by M. Ingres, or to richness of colour and brilliancy of light and shade, in which he was surpassed by Paul de la Roche. They have not the exquisite classical feeling of the 'Stratonice'—a work of M. Ingres which might have been detached from the frescoes of the Carracci in the Farnese Palace,—they have not the varied splendour of the hemicycle in the Ecole des Beaux Arts at Paris, or the Shakspearian power of the 'Assassination of the Duc de Guise.' Yet Ary Scheffer takes rank without dispute in the triumvirate of the greatest French painters of our age. Inferior to his most illustrious rivals in technical skill and in vigour of execution, he rises above them by the loftiness and purity of his conceptions,—by the ideal beauty with which he clothed the most touching creations of Dante and Goethe,—and by the contemplative genius which imbued his later works with the tenderness and sublimity of religion. The true secret of this success lay in his marvellous power of *expression.* It is that which makes his portraits live; which surrounds his Gretchen, in the series of pictures from Faust, with inimitable grace and innocence; which opens Heaven itself to the entranced eye of the young Augustine; and which has interpreted, with all but complete success, some of the loftiest of the Christian mysteries in the 'Christus Consolator' and the 'Temptation of our Lord.' This power of expression was closely allied to the qualities of his intellect and of his character. The conceptions of his genius were not those alone which he embodied upon canvass; they formed part of his friendships, of his actions, of his daily life; and if we were asked to explain the charm which pervades the tribute paid to the memory of this great artist in the volume now before us, we should reply that it consists in the skill with which Mrs. Grote has enlisted the sympathies of her readers in favour of the man. Perhaps she may be accused of an amiable unconsciousness of some flaws and frailties in a character which she describes as that of 'Genius allied to Virtue,' but we shall not assume the invidious task of pointing them out. For no one can lay down this volume without the conviction that it contains the life of a high-minded and generous man, a thorough artist, and an accomplished gentleman, described by a pen eminently qualified to do justice to the noble graces of his character.

The contemplative element which predominated in the temperament and in the paintings of Ary Scheffer may in some degree be referred to the circumstances of his birth, which made him by name and accident alone a Frenchman. His mother, who exercised a powerful influence over his whole life, was a Dutch lady residing at Dort, who married a German artist named Scheffer. The events of the French revolutionary wars converted the Dutch provinces into French departments, and the fortune of the family was lost in these convulsions. Madame Scheffer repaired to Paris in 1811, when her eldest son Ary was about sixteen years of age. He had already embarked with enthusiasm in the profession of his father. He continued his studies in Guérin's studio; but before he was eighteen the exigencies of his mother's position compelled him to paint for profit. The number of these early works of the painter was prodigiously great, and some of his tender and familiar compositions at this period attained a considerable degree of popularity. But it was long before he attained to that grandeur of conception and breadth of execution which stamped him a great painter. He rose to the highest eminence, but he rose gradually, and his progress corresponded to that of the age in which he lived. Upon his arrival in Paris, the school of David reigned supreme. Pierre Guérin, who was Scheffer's master, was no more than a slavish disciple of it. But as Scheffer himself remarks: 'The 'art of painting, so far from being limited to a formal type of 'design, is not confined to drawing; it embraces colour, effect, 'passion, place, time, for the whole range of history, and not a 'single epoch, is its domain.'

No period in the present century—few periods, we may add, in the history of modern Europe—have witnessed a more brilliant display of all the living powers and generous emotions of the human mind, than that which followed in France the restoration of the monarchy with free institutions in 1815. The icy bonds of imperial despotism, the storms and convulsions of incessant war, had just passed like the terrors of a long winter. For the first time since the commencement of the great Revolution, the French nation felt itself secure at home and at peace with the world. The blossoms of liberty broke forth with the luxuriance of a genial spring. The political assemblies of the regenerated monarchy rang with eloquence; the literature of France cast off the stiff and monotonous traditions of the school, to ally itself more nearly to the romantic genius of England, Germany, and Spain: and in the fine arts, a more intelligent study of nature, a more enlarged acquaintance with the true principles of taste, laid the basis of that great modern

school which, in painting, music, sculpture, and architecture, has filled Europe with its productions, and produced the most refined works of our age. In this constellation of eminent men —still young in years and brilliant with all the hopes of life— Ary Scheffer soon took a conspicuous place. His manly disposition, his open heart, his ready hand, allied him naturally, not only to his brother artists, but to all who were contending for freedom of thought, for political independence, and for the advancement of truth; and in the society which assembled round M. de Lafayette in the hospitable halls of La Grange, or which attached itself to the rising fortunes of the Houses of Orleans, none was more welcome than the young painter, whose destiny was hereafter to be so singularly mixed up with the political changes of his times.*

When we look back on that period which promised, and might have bestowed, so much of freedom, peace, and happiness to France, it is impossible not to exclaim —

'Ah! fortunati nimiùm sua si bona nôrint.'

Contrasted with the effects of the revolutions which we have since witnessed, the worst errors of the governments of Louis the Eighteenth, Charles the Tenth, and Louis Philippe were consistent with law and liberty.† But the destruction of the

* Lady Morgan, in the 'Passages from my Autobiography,' published a short time before her death, has left us a lively picture of the society at La Grange, where she paid a visit to Lafayette in September, 1818. Ary Scheffer was of the party, and is described as 'a young but already celebrated artist, who was then painting the 'general's picture.' Lady Morgan herself sat to him on the following day. Scheffer was then only three and twenty.

† The French, including even men of high ability and eloquence, have always been incapable of weighing, with fairness and candour, the *relative* merits of the existing government. With them, whatever is, is *worst*. Thus in April 1832, very soon after the revolution of July, and under a perfectly constitutional *régime*, a member of the French Chamber, 'of no mean personal distinction,' writes to Mrs. Grote —

'Que dites vous de la marche déplorable que suit notre gouvernement depuis qu'il a été créé et mis au monde? Je m'imagine que nous vous faisons pitié, si même nous ne vous inspirons pas un sentiment encore moins flatteur. Nous avons pris un peu de tous les régimes qui nous ont précédés; la corruption du Directoire, les fanfaronades et les brutalités de l'Empire, l'hypocrisie et la lacheté de la Réstoration. Tout cela, mis ensemble, et bien mélangé, forme un composé qui s'est appelé "le Juste-milieu." Je me hâte de dire, pour l'honneur de la France, que c'est le gouvernement le plus impopulaire que nous ayons vu depuis un demi siècle.' (P. 53.)

Constitution was to be brought about by the violence and discontent of its champions as much as by the attacks of its enemies; and the society to which Scheffer and his brethren belonged was already, in its blind ardour for extreme principles, preparing the catastrophe which cast so terrible a gloom over the later years of their existence. Speaking of himself about the year 1820, he says:—

'We were all young men, and were become Frenchmen with our whole heart and soul: as such, we entered into the political agitation of our times. The youth of France entertained towards the Bourbon dynasty that general mistrust and dislike which came to a regular outburst in the year 1830. With the impatient ardour of early manhood, they would have brought about a much earlier "cataclysme," had they found means to inflame the public feeling sufficiently. With this view, conspiracies, secret societies and schemes, were set agoing, in which we all bore our share; I may even say that we played a leading part in them. Our personal liberty, our life indeed, was imperilled by these proceedings. Our mother was not uninformed of them, but she respected our convictions, and what we looked upon as our duty. She would hardly have survived the loss of any one of her three sons; notwithstanding this, she never forbade us to risk our heads: in fact, there was a moment when she permitted us, all, to plunge into dangers, out of which we escaped, as it were, through a miracle of good fortune. This was pushing maternal tenderness to its extremest verge, for, I repeat it again, the death of any one of us would have brought *her* to her end.' (P. 18.)

In 1822 they were even engaged in the disastrous conspiracy of Béfort, and narrowly escaped the serious consequences of that imprudent affair. Hence when the Revolution of 1830 occurred, he was in a position to take an active part in the events of the time, more especially from his intimacy with the Lafayettes and with the Orleans family. The details given by Mrs. Grote of this passage in his history are extremely curious:—

'The ferment into which Paris was thrown by the news of the famous "Ordonnances," gave occasion to the surmise that matters were likely to come to some forcible collision. On the morning of the 28th July, Scheffer, being abroad early in the streets, met a political friend going towards the "barrière." "Ho!" quoth Scheffer, "why, your steps are turned in the wrong direction; you ought to stay in Paris, and stand by your friends at this critical juncture." "Ah! my dear fellow, you must know that *I* am not a fighting man, and I foresee that there will be a hard struggle between the soldiers and the people." "I expect no less," rejoined Ary; "mais la partie est engagée, et il faut la jouer." The friend, nevertheless, went his way, and, sure enough, the conflict quickly commenced — with what ardour and what unflinching bravery we all of us well recollect.

Scheffer was among those who fought unceasingly through two of the "glorious days" which crowned the resistance with victory.

'On the morrow of the third and decisive day of July, that is to say, on the 30th, Scheffer, fairly tired out with the efforts of the three previous days, was in his own house in the Rue Chaptal (the same in which he continued to reside until his death), when he was surprised by the entrance of Monsieur Thiers. "Eh bien! Scheffer, me voici! j'ai besoin de vous: j'ai tout fait." "Comment, '*tout fait?*'" calmly inquired Scheffer. "Well, I mean that I have been to the Hôtel de Ville, seen the members of the Municipal Committee, seen the 'Chefs de partis' at Lafitte's, and, in short, I am the bearer of a communication to the Duke of Orleans, which you must assist me in conveying to Neuilly." "Tiens!" replied Scheffer; "so, you mean that I am to go with you as a kind of commissioner from the leaders of the party?" "I do," rejoined M. Thiers, "and for this reason, among others, that you are known to keep good horses in your stable; for, look you, we can go in no other way than by riding on horseback." "That is certain," quoth Scheffer; "the barricades would render the passage of a carriage impossible." "But stay," said Thiers; "how shall I manage about my *monture?* I shall never be able to sit one of *your* great beasts." Thereupon Scheffer hastened to the stables of young Ney (son of the Marshal), with whom he was on intimate terms, and, borrowing a small, nimble nag for his friend, they started on their important errand.

'The barricades presented, in truth, some obstacles to their progress, but Scheffer, being a practised horseman, leaped his horse over them. M. Thiers could not manage matters quite so actively. The mob, however, good-naturedly aided him to scramble through, lifting him, almost bodily, over the piles of stones, &c., horse and all, laughing heartily at "le petit commis" for his bad horsemanship. As M. Thiers rode in white stockings and shoes, and wore spectacles, I suspect that his personal appearance did afford some scope for the light-hearted jokes of "le peuple" on that morning.

'When, at length, the two gentlemen found themselves fairly outside of the walls of Paris, a number of men of the lower class crowded about them — "Où allez-vous donc, Messieurs?" "Cela ne vous regarde pas." "Eh bien! then we shall send some of our fellows with you, to *see* where you go to." A couple of "blouses" accordingly accompanied them, each mounted on horseback, and armed. The party had not trotted far on their road before Thiers said, in a quiet tone of voice, to his companion, "Ecoutez, mon cher! you are a good rider, whilst *I* may very easily get a tumble before I reach Neuilly; and if this should happen, my hat will inevitably roll off, and the *mandât* which, before we set off, I put therein for safety, may be discovered, and then I shall get into trouble: I beg you will take charge of it." Scheffer took the paper, and placed it in his breast pocket. It was a sort of *blanc seing*, to which the names of Lafayette, Lafitte, Marshals Lobau and Gérard, and one or two other leading men, were appended. The Duke, it was expected, would, on

looking at the paper, frame some sort of "declaration" in reply to the missive.

'At the Bridge of Neuilly, Scheffer wanted sadly to get rid of his neighbours in the "blouses." Pretending to descry some of the King's troops at a distance, he cried out, "Ah! here come our friends, I see; it is the royal guard!" Whereupon the two attendants judged it prudent to wish them "good morning," and to turn their horses' heads the other way. The two envoys quickly arrived at the Château de Neuilly. M. Scheffer (from whose lips I learned what has been related above) gave me no details of what passed within its walls, except to mention one circumstance, viz., that Madame Adelaide, addressing her brother, had said, "Sire! conduisez-vous en Roi." [An odd expression, as he was not yet King.]

'Let me halt a space here to invite attention to the singular fate of Scheffer, in reference to his connexion with the family of Orleans. We have seen that he was the first to open up a prospect of the crown of France to his royal patron, in 1830 — eighteen years later, it is again Scheffer, as we shall find, who, by pure accident, hands the King into the "remise" which bears him away from his capital — never more to return — a dethroned monarch and a fugitive!' (Pp. 30–4.)

Mrs. Grote's narrative of the part taken by Scheffer in the flight of the royal family is even more curious and graphic than the passage we have just quoted; but we prefer to turn to the more pleasing subject of Scheffer's private intercourse with his illustrious friends, and to his qualities as a painter.

It was by Baron Gérard that Ary Scheffer was introduced, in 1826, to the family of the Duke and Duchess of Orleans; and as Mrs. Grote observes, this event was destined to exercise a sensible influence over his whole life. Within this circle he contracted relations of the purest and most delightful character, devoid alike of subserviency on the one side and of patronage on the other. The poetic and sentimental side of Scheffer's mind found nurture and encouragement there, whilst his love of political progress derived support from the sympathy of the head of the house for the Liberal cause. Thus, although he had entered Neuilly chiefly as the instructor of the royal children in drawing, he soon became the friend of their parents and of his former pupils in after life. In good and in evil fortune he remained unalterably attached to the members of that illustrious family, which has shone, and still shines, not less by its serene dignity in exile, than by the genius, the heroism, the varied accomplishments, and the private virtues of its members. The last work of Scheffer's hand was the portrait of Queen Amélie painted at Claremont in 1857, which is now in the gallery of Orleans House at Twickenham; and the last

effort of his life was to attend the funeral of the Duchess of Orleans at Weybridge.

When we apply the word 'genius' to a member of the Royal Family of France, it will readily be understood that we allude particularly to the late Princess Marie of Wirtemberg, whose works in sculpture entitle her to that designation. The noble and pathetic figure of Joan of Arc, executed by the Princess for the Versailles Museum, ranks, without doubt, among the finest productions of modern art; and if we recall to mind the associations connected with it, no marble in existence can inspire a purer or more touching emotion. Between the Princess Marie and Scheffer a high degree of intimacy arose from their congenial tastes, from their profound sympathy in art, and perhaps also from a common tinge of adventure and independence in their characters. Mrs. Grote has been fortunate enough to obtain from the family of M. Scheffer some notes written by himself for his brother Arnold in 1839, shortly after the death of his charming and lamented friend and pupil. They are alike honourable to both of them:—

'To furnish you, my dear Arnold, with what you require of me, viz., some particulars respecting the Princess Marie of Orleans, is no easy task for me to attempt.

'She was brought up after the manner of all princesses, by Madame de Malet, a person of education, and religiously disposed, but having exceedingly narrow and restricted ideas of things. The Princess was, as a child, impertinent, heedless, and wild to a degree; yet she learned what she was taught — languages, history, and so forth — though habitually indulging in saucy sallies at the expense of her instructors. One of these alone (M. Pradher) managed to control the Princess, and, by an inflexible sternness, untinged with angry temper, to inspire his pupil with respect. He also directed (and with ability) her musical talent, which, in itself, was above the ordinary level.

'Such lessons as, from the age of twelve years and onwards, I had been in the habit of giving her, were never much else than an amusing pastime, either for master or pupil. The Princess made but slight progress, and could at no time draw a head correctly from the plaster model. Upon the marriage of her elder sister, this young girl, till now careless and unreflecting, became all at once serious and pensive. She entreated me earnestly to afford her instruction of a nature to occupy and interest her mind, and to distract her attention from the loss she had sustained; but she added that, "as to setting about to *copy*, it was too tiresome an affair by half for "her to attempt it."

'So she took to composing historical subjects, washing them in with water colour. The very first trials which she made, revealed

to me the existence of undoubted talent, and of her imaginative faculty. Within the space of two years, she executed more than fifty drawings; all of them showing a certain power of design, carried out with originality and good general effect, though faulty in drawing, and but indifferently coloured. The contracted notions of Madame de Malet, the scruples of the Queen, and the reverential feeling in my own breast, as towards maidenly purity and reserve — all these offered serious impediments to regular artistic instruction; so that, being restricted to the copying of draped figures, (and those *abundantly* draped,) the Princess remained, of necessity, wholly unacquainted with the structure of the human body.

'At length, weary of composing cleverly, and executing unskilfully, she became out of humour with her drawing; and one day she inquired of me, "whether I could not find something for her to do, "less dull and monotonous, and less like what other people did?" To say the truth, I was myself somewhat tired of having continually to correct her bad drawing of legs and arms, often distorted and out of all shape. I suggested, then, to the Princess the idea of trying her hand at modelling and sculpture: a walk of art wherein I was equally unpractised with herself, and which therefore offered to both of us the attraction of novelty.

'Our first essay was the small bas-relief of "Göetz and Martin;" very simply designed, and executed with the imperfect skill of mere novices. This was not a very encouraging beginning, certainly; but it happened that on the day when the plaster cast of the clay model was sent home, M. Quinet's book, "Ahasuerus," fell into the hands of the Princess. She began a group forthwith, of "Ahasuerus re-"fused admittance within the abode of the Angel Gabriel." In this "bas-relief" was now disclosed the indubitable instinct of a sculptor. Along with a perception of distances (by diversity of surface), and quite an original style of arranging the figures, there was joined so much of expression, that the whole thing bore evidence of a true vocation for the art.

'From this moment, a passion for sculpture took deep hold of the Princess, and I must own that I felt scarcely less pleasure in giving her lessons in it. Whilst *she* was at work, *I* sought out suitable subjects for her to execute; in the works of Quinet, then in those of Schiller (which were new to her): and later, from those of Goethe. Her first choice fell upon "le Reveil du Pöete," from which she "composed" the whole of a bas-relief: my aid being rendered by drawing heads for her on paper. Viewed as an ideal piece of sculpture, and furthermore, as a triumph over recognised difficulties, this performance must be regarded as something extraordinary in itself; but, as the production of a young girl, who was actually only at her third attempt in modelling, and who had read works of poetry and fiction under the sober influence of a gouvernante of strict piety, this work is truly surprising; the gradations of the ground plan, and the characteristic indications of the various personages introduced, being managed with singular and happy ingenuity.

'After completing this "bas-relief," she modelled the "Joan of

"Arc on horseback," of which the conception is entirely due to herself. The figure of "Joan" has much merit, but in the manipulation of this model I gave the Princess a good deal of help.'

We believe this group, together with some other studies by the Princess, is now in the Duc d'Aumale's collection at Twickenham. The group here described represents Joan of Arc on horseback, at the instant she has, for the first time, dealt a blow which prostrates a man-at-arms lifeless at the feet of her charger. The mixed expression of enthusiasm, terror, and pity is very finely rendered.

'About this period, the King had bespoken of Pradier — our most approved artist in statuary — a monumental figure of Joan of Arc, for the museum of Versailles. Pradier chanced to be in no happy vein at the moment, and so produced a design, which fell far short of the mark. The King, not feeling satisfied with it, asked his daughter to try and invent another; she accepted the commission, after consulting with myself, but coupled her acceptance with this stipulation —that should her design be successful, she should be entrusted with the execution of it in the marble.

'She then set to work upon the modelling of her celebrated figure, "Joan of Arc watching by her Armour," in attempting which, both the fair sculptor and myself found ourselves very deficient in the mechanical experience required. Instead of moulding the form in clay, we took it into our heads to model it in wax. It fell to pieces more than once, then it bent down at a third attempt; furthermore, living models were unattainable. For all this, the statue finally came out the finest *modern* figure to be found at Versailles! Not alone does its impressive attitude, its simplicity, and its distinctive feminine character contrast favourably with certain vulgar productions among which it stands, but it carries upon itself the stamp both of the genius and the elevation of soul possessed by its author.

'The success which attended the appearance of this statue was prodigious. The most flattering applause was lavished upon it, yet I never saw flattery received with greater indifference than by this Princess. Though always manifesting, more or less plainly, her contempt for the "official tribe" around her, she was as delighted as would have been any child, at the success of her work among *the people;* and, more than all, with the admiration bestowed on it by the soldiers.

'Succeeding to the above came — I. "The Peri" bearing the tears of the repentant sinner to the foot of the throne of grace. II. Angel at the gate of Heaven. III. Ahasuerus and Rachel. IV. Bust of her sister, with her son. V. Two small equestrian groups; and VI. the "Pilgrim," from Schiller. In each of these performances, and in some which followed, decided and progressive improvement was discernible. The occupation had, indeed, taken such hold upon her that, unknown to her parents, she would actually sit up at night to pursue it. Her settled dream was, to lead the life of an elevated,

conscientious artist, and thus to exercise a beneficial influence over high art in France. She chose for her studies books calculated to ripen and develope her intellectual faculties. Scientific treatises, imaginative works. Everything was read, and read with profit, by her. All that seemed great and worthy of admiration she prized at its full value. Thus, on learning the sad end of Armand Carrel, the tears rose to her eyes, notwithstanding that he was, and that she knew him to be, perhaps the most formidable among the enemies of her house.

'In the heart of this Princess dwelt a religious faith, such as became a noble, womanly heart. . . Her pulmonary disease, which lasted several months — months of physical suffering — was borne with a resignation and courageous self-command worthy of herself. She was aware, indeed, of the inevitable fate which hung over her, even before she took leave of her family to go to her new home in Wirtemberg.

'A. S., 1839.'

(Pp. 38–48.)

Connected as he was with the Royal Family by so many ties, though strongly opposed to the policy of the Cabinet and the personal influence of the King, it may readily be imagined with what feelings of regret Scheffer viewed the fall of the Constitutional Monarchy in 1848, although that catastrophe had not been unforeseen by him. But those feelings of regret were still more deeply excited by the *coup d'état* of the 2nd December, 1851: the effect of that event on him was overpowering, and Mrs. Grote has described it with the utmost sympathy and force:—

I called at his residence within a day or two of the terrible slaughter of the Parisians in their houses and in their streets — that is to say, as soon as it was prudent to venture forth. I found Scheffer at home, and alone with his wife. The interview was, in a measure, at once solemn and sad. The collective ruins of thirty years' illusory hopes and struggles stood before me, as it were; whilst in the few broken phrases which Scheffer's emotion permitted of his uttering, was revealed the anguish of final despair.

'It would have argued a want of reverence and sympathy towards this noble but aching heart, to seek to maintain the conversation beyond a few minutes, and I accordingly withdrew. Madame Sophie Scheffer followed me into the court — "You see how he suffers!" whispered she: — I pressed her hand; but said nothing — what was there to *be said?*' (Pp. 94, 95.)

A friend present drew from his pocket a list of the persons just arrested by Louis Napoleon. It contained all the most eminent and illustrious names in France, of whose destination nothing could then be learned:—

'The reading of this document aroused Scheffer's ire beyond con-

trol: his eyes seemed to flash fire; he paced the atelier with wavering steps, giving vent at intervals to his feelings by emphatic exclamations inspired by his honest, just wrath. The scene was one not to be forgotten.

'If there be a spectacle touching on the morally sublime, it is that of a high-souled man, conscious of having strenuously laboured for his country's weal, in every way open to him, during his whole life, who beholds that country's laws and liberties abrogated by the audacious employment of military force. This was not, however, the only occasion on which I had the pain of beholding such a sight. Among the noble, patriotic, and pure-minded Frenchmen, with whom it has been my good fortune to be acquainted, three of the most distinguished may be said — figuratively speaking — to have "died of "their wounds;" namely, Léon Faucher, Ary Scheffer, and lastly, Alexis de Tocqueville, of whose mental anguish I have been, in each case, a sympathising witness.

'The memorable event, which is commonly known as "the coup-"d'état," has been the theme of such endless volumes of controversy, and is even now viewed in such different lights, according to the cast of sentiment of the individual who judges of its complexion, that it would be quite out of place were I here to expatiate anew upon its character. I conceive that it will continue, as hitherto, to divide the opinions of those two great sections of society — the upholders of moral obligation on the one side, the partisans of triumphant violence on the other — which are likely to compose the human family throughout all time. I only wish that it were permitted to me to hope that the former section would, one day, outnumber the latter!' (P. 96.)

These events — the loss of his noblest friendships and of his noblest hopes for his country — threw a gloom over the later years of his life, which neither his great fame, nor constant devotion to his works, could dispel; and before the closing hour arrived on his return from the funeral of the Duchess of Orleans in 1858, those around him felt that he was thoroughly weary of life. He had barely completed his sixty-third year when he expired, retaining to the last, and in the highest perfection, the mastery of the art which will hand down his name to the future. It was on the 15th June, 1858 (we borrow the touching language of his biographer), 'that this great and virtuous man 'yielded up his last breath. It was a beautiful summer's even-'ing, the calm splendour of which irradiated the scene of his 'departure from earth. Not more calm, however — not more 'serene, was the aspect of the heavens, than were the conscience 'and pure spirit of him who thus passed to his eternal rest, to 'suffer, to strive no more.'

The warm interest felt by Mrs. Grote in the life and character of Ary Scheffer, she has successfully imparted to this

record of him; and it is remarkable, that though he was not exempt from the national prejudices of the French democracy against the English, the friendship of an Englishwoman should have paid the best tribute to his fame. But we regret that Mrs. Grote should have treated the painter far more summarily than she has treated the man. Ary Scheffer's real life, in as far as it concerns the public, is to be found in his works; and from the succinct remarks Mrs. Grote has here and there thrown out on this part of our subject, we are satisfied that she would have dealt more successfully with it, if she had dwelt upon it at greater length.

We have already indicated our own opinion of Scheffer's predominant excellence. It corresponds exactly with that of a friendly critic quoted in the concluding chapter of the 'Memoir,' who says:—

'To my thinking, Scheffer is never so great, at least in creative art, as where he employs scarcely *any colour*, properly speaking. As a painter of heads I doubt whether there be any living painter who has so successfully cultivated the faculty of expressing profound emotion; and this, too, coupled with a motionless position of the body. Here is the real triumph of Scheffer's genius — the ability to inspire strong sympathy in the spectator by the power of delineating the emotions of the soul. A gift which he shared with Murillo, and which commands admiration, not only for its own sake, but also on account of its extreme rarity.' (P. 148.)

An accurate survey of the works of Scheffer from his first entrance into life to his death, indicates the steady and constant growth of his talent, and especially of that ideal power which was his noblest gift. His early works belonged to that class of painting which may be termed 'anecdotical.' The very names of them remind us of that period, already so remote from the present time, when Walter Scott's novels and Lord Byron's poems inflamed the imagination of all Europe. It was not, we think, till after 1830 that he rose to loftier conceptions, and executed them with unbounded power. The inspiration of these great works was first drawn from the poems of Goethe. The 'Faust 'in his Study,' now at Claremont, and the 'King of Thule,' painted in 1836, are two of the finest examples extant of the force he sometimes attained in colour; the two pictures of 'Mignon,' bequeathed by the Duke of Orleans to Count Molé, are not less consummate specimens of his extreme refinement in expression. The marvellous picture of 'Francesca di Rimini' belongs to about the same time; we well remember the intense admiration and delight it occasioned on the opening of the Salon of Paris in 1835. It may be inferred that in this and

the following year Scheffer was in the fullest perfection and maturity of his genius. But his triumph as a great painter of expression was not yet complete. As he advanced in life the religious element assumed a stronger influence over his thoughts.

'The books of the Old Testament were perhaps those most frequently seen in his hand, during the last eight years of his life. The study of pastoral, primitive, rude forms of society, — with the touching episodes here and there occurring in the history of those early peoples, — had an unfading attraction for Scheffer; whilst it served to prevent his mind and thoughts from brooding over the actual state of things in France. Still, it was from the New Testament that the larger number of his sacred compositions were taken; for he loved to dwell upon the humanising influences, and devotional feelings, connected with the mission of Jesus Christ, whose ideal lineaments it was ever his loftiest ambition to portray.' (Pp. 100, 101.)

The 'Christus Consolator,' in which, with a divine sympathy, the painter has gathered the weary and the heavily laden of every race and every clime around the throne of mercy and of love,— the 'Augustine and his Mother,' where he has combined in one intensity of gaze the strength of filial piety and of Christian faith, — the 'Dante and Beatrice,' and the 'Temptation of Christ,' the most mysterious and arduous of all his conceptions, — which indeed he vainly strove entirely to realise, — mark the progress of his mind in the direction of serious, we had almost said of ascetic thought. How immeasurably distant are such works of ideal grandeur as these, from the conventional attitudes and statuesque forms of Guérin's studio or David's school! But whilst we do ample justice to the exalted character of his latest works, they appear to us inferior to some of his earlier productions in manual dexterity, and especially in colour. His flesh became mealy and unnatural; his figures faded into phantoms; and in the pursuit of an ideal excellence and beauty he was led to sacrifice something of the reality and truth of his second manner. On the occasion of a journey to Belgium and Holland, which he made in 1849, he was painfully struck by the superior force of the Flemish and Dutch painters in the practical command of their art: he exclaimed, that in comparison with them he seemed 'to feel himself but 'half a painter,' and he applied himself with fresh energy to the improvement of his style. But to the last he scarcely realised his finest conceptions.

This brief notice of his works would be incomplete if we passed over in silence Ary Scheffer's portraits. They were for the most part painted with as high a feeling and as genial a

power as the finest efforts of his imagination, for he undertook no portraiture which did not touch his feelings, either by the stamp of intellectual power, historical interest, artistic sympathy, or personal affection.* The collection of these works, though not very numerous, is therefore of extreme interest; in addition to the fine portrait of the 'Duchess de Broglie,' mentioned by Mrs. Grote, it includes the memorable picture of 'Prince Talleyrand,' recently bequeathed by the late Lord Holland to the Duc d'Aumale; the striking head of 'General 'Cavaignac,' painted immediately after the events of 1848; the inspired countenances of such children of genius as 'Madame 'Viardot' and 'Listz'; the maternal dignity of 'Madame Guizot,' the mother of the minister; and, above all, the touching and majestic picture of Scheffer's most venerated and constant friend 'Queen Amélie.'

The vicissitudes of the age have already caused not a few of the finest works of Ary Scheffer to reach this country, where they are deservedly held in high honour. In spite of his ardent attachment to France, Scheffer lived long enough to feel that a man may endure the griefs of exile without leaving his own house. To a soul like his, eager in its aspirations for freedom and for honour, it was exile to breathe the air of an enslaved capital, for the yoke and burden of despotic power lies most heavy on the hearts of those who, like Scheffer, unite the energy of genius with an imperishable faith in the nobler destinies of society and of man. The return of the Imperial despotism in France seems to have extinguished the lustre of literature and the arts, as swiftly as the restoration of liberty in 1815 kindled the genius of the nation into fire. In the rising generation of Frenchmen we hear of no rivals or successors to those poets, historians, philosophers, and painters, who have made the first half of the present century famous. An age of apathy and mediocrity has succeeded to an age of extraordinary activity and excellence; but the cultivated intellect of the world will long look back with deep interest to those who, like Ary Scheffer, belonged to the most brilliant epoch of contemporary history.

* In 1853, after Monseigneur Sibour, Archbishop of Paris, and an old acquaintance of Scheffer's in earlier days, had gone over to the Court, a note arrived one day from the prelate requesting Scheffer to paint his portrait. To this note the indignant Ary replied that he would *not* paint the archbishop, and begged him never more to set foot in his atelier!

ART. VIII.—1. *La Vérité sur la Russie.* Par LE PRINCE PIERRE DOLGOROUKOW. Paris: 1860.

2. *La Russie et les Russes.* Par N. TOURGUENEFF. Paris: 1847.

3. *Un Dernier Mot sur l'Emancipation des Serfs en Russie.* Par N. TOURGUENEFF. Paris: 1860.

4. *La Question du Servage en Russie.* Par M. L. WOLOWSKI. Revue des Deux Mondes, Juillet et Août: 1858.

5. *The Russians of the South.* By SHIRLEY BROOKS. London: 1854.

6. *Russland unter Alexander II. Nicolajewitsch. Zur innern Geschichte und äussern Politik vom Thronwechsel bis auf die Gegenwart.* 1855–1860. Leipsig: 1860.

THE subject of serf-emancipation in Russia is a very interesting one to the civilised world generally, and particularly to those nations in Europe and America who have been or are vexed by the calamity of negro slavery. Those who have abolished that slavery speak confidently of the practicability of emancipating the serfs of Russia; while, in the United States, where the very existence of the Republic now immediately depends on an approaching settlement of the slavery question, the two sections of the nation are respectively triumphing in the avowed intention of the Russian Emperor to emancipate the serfs, and in the obvious difficulty which attends the operation. At such a time, the work of Prince Dolgoroukow is important and interesting in the highest degree. It discloses the radical difference between the two questions of making free labourers of an African race who were imported as slaves to a superior race, and of restoring to citizenship a class of natives who were once as free as the rest of the Russian people, and who have unquestionably all the natural requisites for the citizenship of which they were arbitrarily and gradually deprived. It exhibits the implication of the emancipation question with the whole structure of society in Russia; so that its solution involves a modification of the whole social edifice. The scene was partially disclosed by M. Tourgueneff, in his interesting personal narrative, and the disquisitions connected with it, published under the title of 'Russia and the Russians,' a dozen years ago. That work taught us when and how serfage originated, and what had been done and proposed by the successive sovereigns of Russia to create, to

modify, and afterwards to abolish, the institution: but for the first time we now learn from Prince Dolgoroukow the whole truth about the perilous condition of the Russian polity, and its certain doom if the project of the present Emperor should miscarry, or its fulfilment be long delayed.

Prince Dolgoroukow has devoted himself to the redemption of his country in a singular way. In his Introduction he says: —

'A book on Russia must be by a Russian, my country resembling no other, and its historical development having taken place under circumstances altogether exceptional. But under a censorship, and especially the Russian censorship, troubled with two incurable maladies, fear and idiocy, it is impossible to print a book on Russia except in a foreign country. There are five or six Russian presses in Europe; and many of my countrymen will probably manifest surprise at my writing in French, instead of our national language. I must explain the reasons which have determined me to do this. In Russia there is a strong hatred and fear of publicity on the part of the retrograde party, who, if they had their own way, would drag the Empire towards a political chaos; and on the part of the Russian bureaucracy, the zealous support and permanent adviser of the retrograde party, united as they are by their common affection for official falsehood, and for the mystery which protects that falsehood. But what they especially dread is European publicity; and, above all, publicity in the French language, the best known in all the countries in the world. It follows that, in attacking the retrograde party and the bureaucracy, it is necessary to have recourse to the French language, the weapon most formidable to the two enemies of the prosperity and greatness of Russia.

'I have bestowed much study on the history of my own country: I have known most of the men who, for twenty-five years, have been in power in Russia, and most of those who are in office at present. I know their biography and their intimate connections. I have even had the means of knowing the secret causes of many events. I have lived in both the Russian capitals, and in the interior of the country. I have undergone exile, and I have been in relation with persons of the most various social positions, from the loftiest to the lowliest.' (*La Vérité sur la Russie*, p. 2.)

To ensure this European publicity, and render his knowledge available for the service of his country, Prince Dolgoroukow, thus qualified, has fixed his residence abroad, and written a book which renders it impossible that he should ever return to Russia, unless the change and renovation, which are the only hope for the empire, should take place in time to enable him to resume his place there with the safety and honour which are his due. Before making the prodigious disclosures which he has offered in a language universally familiar, he has taken care to place in safety in England a mass of documentary

evidence which he promises to publish in two or three years in a Memoir of his own times; and, judging by the narratives and anecdotes already before us, he must be, if not the boldest of men, the boldest of Russians, and either indifferent to the opinion of his countrymen, or such a self-sacrificing patriot as it must require extreme magnanimity in an absolute sovereign to appreciate. He gives credit for such magnanimity to Alexander II.; and his high estimate of the intentions of his sovereign can alone save him from the charge of high treason against the Emperor while devoting himself to the redemption of the Russian people. He proclaims that the Emperors of Russia are thoroughly and systematically deceived about whatever concerns them most: that the Court is inaccessible: that a mendacious camarilla and an undying bureaucracy are bringing on a revolution which will let loose, not only the serfs, but all the bad passions of a population of sixty millions. The following is his view of the Russia of to-day, not offered in the way of assertion, but after having discussed and illustrated each point of the statement in the preceding chapters of his book:—

'If we cast a glance over this vast empire of Russia, which occupies a ninth part of the globe, what do we see? No justice! The suitor has to go through ten successive processes, generally with his purse in his hand, to obtain, in the eleventh stage, a definitive decision from the Imperial will and pleasure. The will and pleasure of the Emperor Alexander II. are the same thing as the sense of equity of a just-minded prince; but Alexander II., excellent as he is, is a man like the rest of us. He is not an institution. He is mortal, like others: and we need not go far back in Russian history to find the period when the will and pleasure of the sovereign, that *alpha* and *omega* of our government, was only the caprice of a tyrant! The administration is a den of venality,—of venality of the lowest kind; everything is sold, and may be bought. As for the Russian clergy, we see most of the bishops playing the obsequious courtier in the presence of power, and the tyrant towards their inferiors, and shameless peculators the while. The inferior clergy, poor, abased, crushed, weep in silence, and pray to God to release them from the oppression under which they groan. Liberty of conscience is trampled under foot at the bidding of power. The press is fettered by a censorship which acts by starts and caprices, and which has done no other service to Russia than causing the establishment of several Russian presses in foreign countries; presses established abroad simply on account of the absurd severity of the censorship in Russia. The nobles are a prey to the keenest dissatisfaction. All of them who have the hearts of men, and are not cursed with the feelings of flunkeys, understand perfectly that they are no more than privileged slaves. They desire to rise to the dignity of freemen, and to substitute genuine institutions for the so-called privileges

which power can trample upon at will! The *bourgeoisie*, constantly insulted and pillaged by the bureaucracy, ardently long for a state of things which has a foundation of law. The serfs await emancipation: and however the retrograde party, the bureaucracy, and the camarilla, may deceive themselves in this matter, the serfs will not allow the imperial promise to be transformed into a *hatti-houmayoun*. The crown peasants, in their turn, are vehemently impatient to be released from the thievish hands of government functionaries. In the army, the soldiers, ill-tended, ill-fed, and subject to the stick, sigh for a better fate. Lastly, the finances, owing to the mismanagement of the administration, and to the antipathy of the camarilla to talent and capacity in every form, are in such a condition as to render the state liable to bankruptcy within a few years, though the country is endowed with a vast wealth of untouched resources. Thanks to the financial crisis, which is growing continually worse, it would be impossible for Russia henceforward to keep up a force of 150,000 men beyond the frontier for a single year, for the simple reason that expenses cannot be paid abroad in paper money. Gold has disappeared, credit fails, and would above all fail for an expenditure so unproductive as war. Besides, the Russian military administration is in a state of complete disorganisation. Thus, how has my country fallen, strong and powerful as it was at the time of the accession of the Emperor Nicholas! It has declined in power through the incapacity of Nicholas, and of the men whom he chose, whom he placed in office, and whom he bequeathed to his successor, an excellent prince, worthy of a better fate. As the result of a war of thirty years against civilisation and good sense, *Russia has sunk to be a second-rate power, and is thought little of in Europe among those who understand the real state of affairs.* The Bœotians of St. Petersburg, who take mystery and official falsehood to be the universal panacea, suppose that these details are unknown to the statesmen of Europe. Let them be undeceived! These details are known; and it is not by falsehood that the country can be extricated from such a slough. The only way of getting out of it is by dismissing imbeciles and thieves, by the banishment of the camarilla, by calling in capable men, by an appeal to publicity, by real reforms, crowned by a system of political guarantees, which, while permitting to the country the sincere expression of opinion, will secure, within the limit assigned by law, a legitimate co-operation with the government; and will at the same time firmly establish the imperial power, now all-powerful in name, but reduced to a mere show by the encroaching action of the bureaucracy and the camarilla, the two leprosies of which Russia must be speedily cured.' (*La Vérité sur la Russie*, pp. 375–8.)

The fundamental mischief, as pointed out in the opening chapter, is one about which there seems to be no dispute. At least, all Russian reformers whose works reach us set out by stating it. It is the falsification of the aspect of the Russian polity. As Prince Dolgoroukow says, the edifice has a European façade, while within it is furnished and administered in

Asiatic fashion. Prince Talleyrand's way of putting it, was, 'Scratch a Russian, and you will find a Tartar underneath.' Our author says the same of the institutions, while thinking better of the men of his nation. There is no want of laws, which are the European costume of the polity. There are fifteen thousand folio pages of laws in the mere Code, besides ordinances and regulations; but nobody is the better for them but the papermakers. The first provision — that the Emperor is above all laws — practically nullifies all the rest. While the laws are thus set aside, the Emperor himself has no power, except for evil. He can terrify, torture, and banish, and might even bid heads fall at his pleasure, like any Khan in Central Asia; but he cannot administer justice, or reform the smallest abuse. The Emperor reigns, says our author: but the bureaucracy governs, by its special autocracy of gold, the only power to which it is faithful.

Aware of deception in a general way, the sovereigns of Russia have had recourse to three checks. A Commission of Requests receives all petitions and complaints addressed to the Emperor. Letters are opened in the Post Office. A secret police is to spy out all abuses, and report them to the sovereign. But the bureaucracy have obtained the management of all the three. Any complaint of any minister is to be referred, in the first instance to that minister, who is to report upon it. Of the opened letters, those only are brought to the Emperor which it is convenient to his servants that he should see; and among these, forged letters are occasionally found. As for the secret police, their office places them in the sunshine of fortune. They can obtain any amount of ransom for omitting to inform against wealthy persons, guilty or innocent of misconduct: and not a few innocent men are now in Siberia, because they were unable or unwilling to bribe, while the grossest misgovernment goes on for a dozen years together, if the offender can induce the police to keep the Emperor ignorant of it. The Governor-General of one of the chief cities of the empire defied decency by his oppressions and corruption for eleven years, declaring that nothing spoiled the comfort of governing so much as the law, and scouting it accordingly, till he became celebrated for his administrative crimes. A faint rumour of something wrong now and then reached the late Czar; but the police answered his inquiries by lamentations over the calumnious tendencies of the human mind. At length, the great man was disgraced — not long ago, for having induced his married daughter to wed a second time, without being divorced from her first husband. It was only by the gossip of the salons that the Emperor heard

of it; and then only after his special police had given timely notice to the lady and her new husband to go abroad;— which they did, not by stealth, but by travelling at their leisure twelve hundred versts along the high road.

So much for the three checks which the emperors suppose themselves to have in their hands. A broad and sincere publicity would, as our author says, be worth all other checks together; 'but publicity is the Medusa's head of the Russian bureaucracy.' It is also too new and bold a method for imperial adoption. The most enterprising of Russian sovereigns have no other idea, says the Prince, than that the old hackney-coachmen are the proper men to drive railway locomotives. It is because Alexander II. is putting his new work into the hands of old officials, that the enterprise of serf-emancipation is doing so badly. What can be expected from an administration determined against the changes which its sovereign decrees, and which is described by one who knows all its chief members, as 'an organised venality, supported by permanent anarchy, disguised, to the eyes of the Emperor and of Europe, by a thick veil of official falsehood?' (P. 16.)

In Prince Dolgoroukow's book this veil is stripped off from all the great departments of the state. We have an exhibition of the Council of State and the department of Justice, of the Senate, of the Executive and the Bureaucratic Hierarchy, of the Military and the Financial departments, and the Political Police. Other chapters describe the Noblesse and the Bourgeoisie, the Clergy and the Peasantry; and others treat of Serf-emancipation and Temperance Societies in connexion with the brandy-monopoly, of the Press, and of Liberty of Conscience. The disclosures under each head are wonderful and shocking; but they are so supported by the author's appeals to living men by name, by anecdotes from his own experience, and by the weight of his own reputation, that it is impossible to doubt the substantial truth of his representations, though his opinions and feelings may dispose him to see things in a gloomy light, and to describe them in terms of immoderate strength.

Take for example his most striking account of what is called the administration of justice in Russia.

'Justice,' says Prince Dolgoroukow, 'exists only by name in Russia.' There was no efficient Code till the time of the Emperor Nicholas; and then the Code was not even pretended to have been submitted to the Assemblies, as in the case of the ancient laws, but was referred to the Council of State, to be passed by them, that Council being composed of imbecile old officials and courtiers. It is enough

to say of this Code that 'it declares the upsetting of a bust of the Emperor to be an act of high-treason; the trade of the informer to be 'a legislative maxim,' and the omission to inform a treasonable crime. According to the morality of the Council, it is blameable to take money as the price of justice if the business is not proceeded with, but right and wise to take the money if the bargain is fulfilled. The *onus* rests with the applicant, who must blame himself if he finds himself deceived. It is with a lawsuit as with any other application to the authorities; for a contract, for instance. A foreigner desired to be a government contractor, and applied to the *chargé d'affaires* of his country for advice how to proceed. The *chargé d'affaires* replied that the business did not fall within his province, but he could explain how such matters were managed in Russia. 'You must give money to Count ——, and to the 'mistress of his father. The elder Count being the head of the 'department in question, and his son having great influence at 'Court, your business will be safe.' 'Alas!' replied the applicant, 'I have given so much to the younger Count, and so 'much to his father's mistress; they took my money, promised 'everything, and have done nothing.' Such is the kind of story told by a multitude of persons who seek, not a lucrative appointment, but justice according to law. The dispensers of the law depend on these bribes for a maintenance, and their salaries are calculated on that basis. The salaries of some of the inferior officers of justice have lately been *raised* to 16*l.* a year, a sum on which the most frugal bachelor can barely present a decent appearance; and married men must, of course, get the means of living where they can. The case, civil or criminal, is bandied about from one authority to another, costing money at each stage, and is no nearer decision at the last than the first. The last appearance but one is before the Council of the Empire, which sits at St. Petersburg on Mondays for the purpose; that is, as many members as may favour and one against him, he has no security whatever that 'the good pleasure' of the Emperor will not side with his one opponent and give judgment against him. At every point of its progress it is perfectly easy to discover some breach of form, and remand the case to its earliest stage. Thus, it is not uncommon to see a cause brought up three or four times, at intervals of years of appellate jurisdiction; and there are no less than eleven stages to be passed through (beginning with the District Tribunal and ending with the Emperor's good pleasure), before a decision can be obtained, a considerable amount of fees being required at each. There are no open courts or oral proceedings, and no counsel. Public opinion

cries out against written and secret justice; but the camarilla and the bureaucracy are immoveable. The present Minister of Justice one day said in Prince Dolgoroukow's salon, to his host himself, that he could not admit the possibility of introducing a bar into the administration of justice, because it would be very dangerous to extend a knowledge of the laws beyond the circle of public functionaries. And yet one of the articles of the Russian Code provides that there shall be no plea of immunity from ignorance of the law. The minister who uttered this remarkable saying has held his office since 1839. There are other anecdotes of him; but the one we have quoted will show what justice must be in Russia, with such a minister at the head of it. Moreover, he does not consider that his business is to watch over the administration of the tribunals, but rather to overrule their proceedings when he thinks proper. By a series of laws and ordinances he is enabled to act as a supreme judge, and to quash any decisions which interfere with his views and prejudices, which are, we are told, peculiarly rancorous.

The exceptional jurisdictions in Russia, especially the military Courts, are a dreadful grievance. In 1856, some weeks after the accession of the present Emperor, a landed proprietor, R——, told his serfs that, being in want of money, he was about to sell them. The peasants raised a considerable sum, which he accepted, on the condition that he would not sell his serfs, and then immediately sold them to a M. P——. The peasants refused obedience to the latter, on the ground that they had paid to avoid a new master. The government sent a young aide-de-camp of the Emperor to the spot to inquire into the business; but the young man, having reasons of his own for courting the new proprietor, took upon him to order the Provincial Council to send to Siberia certain peasants whom he pointed out. Happily the governor of the province, General Alexander Mouravieff, resisted the order, and explained the case to the Minister of the Interior. The moral of the story lies in the fate of the aide-de-camp. Was he disgraced for having set himself up as a military tribunal? Not he; for he was a pet of the camarilla. He was decorated, and received the appointment of Vice-director of the Chancery tribunal of the War Department.

There are narratives far more terrible than this in our author's chapter on Justice as it is in Russia. We can make room for only one of the shortest.

A rich landed proprietor, M. B——, married twice, leaving sons by the first marriage and one young child by the second. The elder sons enrolled their little half-brother among the serfs

of the estate, and took possession of his share of the property. Somebody brought the case before the tribunals, and in course of time it travelled up to the Senate. The Senate desired that all the documents should be brought before them. The mass of papers was forwarded by post; and as soon as it entered the post-house of a village on the road, the place was set on fire 'by 'accident,' and all the papers were burnt. The poor child would have passed his life as a serf, but that his cause was taken up by an old Minister of Alexander I., and gained. At first sight it was a gracious act on the part of an old man, who had the reputation of an inordinate rapacity. It soon appeared, however, that he had not acted inconsiderately. He possessed himself of an enormous sum of money, as his charge for boarding the lad during the period of suspense. It came out also that he had had a partner in the transaction, his confederate being the spy Sh——, who had broken up so many families in 1825, by denouncing to Alexander I. a multitude of members of supposed Secret Societies.

Prince Dolgoroukow gives us, at the end of his chapter on Law and Justice, twelve suggestions for the reform of the department, comprehending the abolition of the knout and the stick, the acknowledgment of equality before the law, publicity and oral procedure, the institution of a bar and of a jury in criminal cases, the abolition of exceptional jurisdictions, the separation of the judiciary from the legal executive, the reduction of the number of the tribunals to three, and the revision of the laws criminal and civil. It is not surprising that among the three tribunals proposed we do not find the Council of State, considering that of its sixty-two members (exclusive of the Imperial family), only one is so young as forty-five, while twenty-nine are between sixty and seventy, seventeen between seventy and eighty, and seven above eighty.

The Senate was once a really dignified body, with a clear duty before it, and substantial power in its hands. After sinking into obsequiousness, and condescending to carry out the absurd and cruel behests of successive Czars, it was degraded in 1810 by being put under the feet of the new Council of State. Its present condition is this: —

'This body is now of no importance, and has no meaning. It is a refuge for general officers who have commanded their divisions of the army in an unsatisfactory way, or perhaps can no longer sit a horse; for admirals who are past the age for venturing to sea; for provincial governors who have not capacity for functions occupied by incapables; and of old bureaucrats whose places are wanted for the minister's own relations or *protegés*. When a place-holder or a

general officer has a stroke of apoplexy, he is put into the Senate. When he has a second, he is put into the Council of the Empire. A third stroke qualifies him to aspire to be a Minister: and if he becomes so, a fourth makes him a candidate for the first vacancy in the post of President of the Council of Ministers.' (*Ibid.*, p. 55.)

The proper business of the Senate is to see that the Ministers do their duty in their several departments; but if it dares to ask a question,—as, for instance, why a delay of ten years had taken place in noticing an inquiry addressed to the department of Highways and Bridges,—it must take the consequences. Its officers may expect to be removed; and some irate minister will probably shake his fist in the face of the first senator he meets, flap its own summons before its eyes, and threaten to tell the Emperor. It will not, however, attempt any more to do its duty, for the Minister of Justice has forbidden it to send forth any inquiry which has not been first submitted to him. In the particular case of the Roads and Bridges, it was worth while to make some effort to stifle inquiry. The Minister of the department had prevented the formation of railways by private companies, lest the Emperor should learn the difference in cost and in receipts between a railway made by the State and by private enterprise. The railway between the two capitals, about 700 kilomètres long, running through a country where there are no mountains, and where the land bears the lowest price, cost 19,200,000*l.*, and yields scarcely anything. It was this Minister, with his particular view of his own interest, who chiefly caused the dreadful distress of the Russian forces in the late war. But for him there would have been railroads enough to carry men, horses, and provisions to the Danube and the Black Sea. As for the Senate, which dares not call such a functionary to account, it is not worth further description. Prince Dolgoroukow has reforms to propose here also; but they would be so complete a renovation, as to make a new institution of the old Russian Senate.

The government of the country outside the offices of the Departments in St. Petersburg is a hopeless wilderness of abuses, through which we do not propose to drag our readers. Our author thus opens to us fresh glimpses into this region of darkness; but other parts of the book are more essential, and to them we pass, after citing a few facts from Prince Dolgoroukow's own experience or personal knowledge.

'I will give only a specimen of the acts of some existing governors-general.

'One of them obtained, in September 1839, an authorisation to punish the disobedience of serfs to their owners according to his own

pleasure, without regard to the limits fixed by law. I have seen another governor-general, an upright and good man, conspicuous for military bravery, but destitute of civil courage, and overruled by an official who is a rancorous enemy of civilisation and enlightenment: I have seen this provincial ruler obtain the suppression of a newspaper, and the imprisonment of the editor in a fortress; and for what offence? For the publication of an archæological article, devoid of any political allusion whatever, and, be it observed, bearing the *imprimatur* of the censorship, simply because that article was written by one of the leaders of the Polish emigration, the illustrious and excellent M. Lelewell. What is the use of a censorship if, after an editor has obtained its *visa*, he is still liable to be thrown into prison and ruined by the suppression of his journal? A third governor-general, displeased at something said at a municipal meeting by a member who was a merchant of the place, sent for him, said insulting things to him, and placed him under arrest, without the smallest legal pretence. The merchant complained to the Senate, which alone has authority over governors. The Senate ventured upon a modest request to the governor-general to explain the business. Upon this the Minister of Justice visited the Senate with a communication which was, in fact, a sharp and insolent reprimand; and the head of the political police, having summoned the aggrieved merchant, informed him that if he dared to proceed in the matter, and if he did not withdraw his complaint, he would be sent into exile without trial or judgment.' (*Ibid.*, p. 67.)

'In one of the chief towns of the empire, some years ago, the wife of the governor-general, well-known for her extortions, acquired an establishment of public baths. Close by stood a humble dwelling belonging to a poor man. The lady desired to purchase the house at little more than half-price, to enlarge the baths. The owner refused to sell: on which he was informed that the governor-general, being invested with full powers, would send him into exile, ostensibly on account of certain political opinions and imprudent talk which would be alleged against him. This was at the time of the panic which hovered over Russia during the latter years of the Emperor Nicholas. Nothing was easier than to send a man into exile; and the unfortunate victim in this case yielded, and sold his house at half its value.'

'In one of the communes of the crown peasants, there was in the open country a great stone weighing several tons. One day the chief of the district arrived, called the peasants together, and announced to them that he had received the Emperor's orders to command them to transport this stone to St. Petersburg. The peasants clamoured against the order, showed the immense weight of the mass, and entreated the official to get them excused from the task. He consented, took large payments from these poor fellows, and promised to petition for the recall of an order which, I need not say, had never been issued.

'At the busiest seasons for field labour, in hay and corn harvest, for instance, official personages are often seen to arrive among the

crown peasants, or on the estates of absent proprietors, to make some investigation or transact some imaginary business. They inquire for the moneyed men among the peasants, and detain them three or four days, on pretence of making them undergo an examination. The urgent necessity of going back to their work determines the peasants to give money to the officials; and the investigation is at an end in the twinkling of an eye.

'Once more: in one of the chief provincial towns a foreigner was thrown down by a cow which was at large in the streets. The unfortunate man was carried to the hospital, where he remained two months. When he went out, the police charged him with the cost of the cow's maintenance for the two months, the animal having been detained during the whole period by the police, as involved in an accusation of assault and battery.' (*Ibid.*, p. 71.)

A few sentences will suffice to show the system on which public business is transacted in Russia. After giving us the scale of offices through which a functionary must pass — amidst perpetual risk of dismissal if he fails to gratify all his superiors — our author observes thus on the long array of counsellors:—

'Russia is the country in which there is the greatest number of counsellors, and in which the least counsel is asked.

'In all civilised countries a man who has devoted ten or twelve years of his life to study, to travelling, to some occupation, whether agricultural, industrial, or commercial, who has acquired some special knowledge, and who understands his own country, may at length fill a public function, and may be eminently useful in it. In Russia it is otherwise. If a man should quit the service for a few years, he can re-enter it only at the point at which he left it. One who has never served must enter at the lowest grade, whatever his age and his merits may be; while a knave, or a half-idiot, if only he never quits office, is secure of attaining the highest posts. Hence the singular anomaly that in a nation like the Russian, so intelligent, so rich in admirable qualities, in which ability pervades the whole population, the administration of public affairs is marked by an incapacity which, becoming more conspicuous towards the top of the scale, appears like actual imbecility in the highest offices of all. Thus it is difficult to conceive how low the Tchine in general, and the highest functionaries in particular, have sunk in public contempt. Among generals in command and privy councillors (a civil rank corresponding to that of general in the army), the greater number are so incapable that they would not even make good clerks. Some are blemished in reputation. An existing privy-councillor is known to have received kicks and canings.' (*Ibid.*, p. 85.)

'Among the reforms which are indispensable if Russia is to be saved from an abyss of destruction, none is more important or can less bear delay than the abolition of the Tchine, an institution which forbids government to employ the able men who may be found in various classes of society, and which obstructs the rapid rise to high

office of men who might have been really useful to their country in that position. The Tchine is, in our day, a mere hot-house for the forcing of idiots and thieves.' (*Ibid.*, p. 88.)

We need not dwell on the military administration in Russia. Our author, being a civilian, adverts to those points only which civilians can understand; — the treatment of the soldiers in regard to food, clothing, and their relations with their officers: and these are the points on which we least need information after the disclosures occasioned by the late war. The bureaucracy managed to baffle inquiry to some extent; and yet more to set aside the awards of the Commission of Investigation: but the world knows that the Russian soldiers were cruelly starved, exposed, and in every way sacrificed by official peculation. A few sentences will show something of the way in which it was done.

The Minister at War called in his father-in-law and his brother-in-law to help him in his administration. Both were put into office; and thus the management of the army became a family affair, free from obstruction and oppositions of opinion. The troops had mouldy biscuit and putrid meat: several of the colonels were paid to say nothing about it: and those who were impracticable received no answer to their complaints. The whole bureaucracy supported the war administration. The Minister's commissariat officers signed receipts for six hundred bullocks when they received five hundred. They might, and did, make up the number out of any herds they passed *en route*. The local authorities in any particular spot gave, for five or six roubles, a certificate of the death of a bullock which had never existed. One agent paraded a dead bullock from day to day, obtaining a fresh certificate every night during the retreat from the Danube. A bolder official boasted of a depôt of 1800 bullocks which never existed. They were paid for first as purchased; then for their feed for some months: then for the killing: then for the salting: so that each of these imaginary beasts was worth 50*l.* to the speculators on ministerial credulity. Again: when the Russian troops occupied the Danubian provinces, in 1853, reserve stores of rye, oats, and hay were ordered to be made, and money was forwarded for the purchase. Little of the money was so laid out: but when the provinces were evacuated in haste in the next year, and representation was made of the impossibility of removing such vast stores of rye, oats, and hay as filled the granaries, an order was issued to burn them: and, as there was scarcely anything to burn, the desirable amount of conflagration was obtained by burning the granaries of some unfortunate Moldavian and Wallachian

proprietors. Again; the clothing and other necessaries of life, sent liberally to the troops from St. Petersburg and Moscow, and from kind-hearted people throughout the empire, never reached them. The officers took what they liked for their own use, and sold the rest to traders. The navy was better managed; and the comforts sent to the sailors were not intercepted at any stage. While they were duly cared for, their unhappy comrades on shore were made a market of in a way which it must have almost broken their sovereign's heart to hear of. The wounded soldier was removed in a jolting cart, ostensibly for some hospital. He had not the warm clothing intended for him, but only a ragged cloak or less, in the bitterest winter weather. He lay in the cart groaning for hours together while those who should have received and tended him were drinking champagne or gaming. When he died, he was thrust into some cellar cold enough to enable the corpse to be kept as long as possible; and the expense of his diet and medicines was charged in the hospital lists till it became necessary to bury him, when the cost of his coffin and shroud was added to the bill. But he was taken to the cemetery in a crowd of corpses, heaped on the bier in such a way that the frail coffins broke; and if a body fell out, it was seen to be entirely naked, in spite of the charge for a shroud. The War Minister was honoured with two decorations: and when, after an investigation, he was condemned to disgrace and punishment, his penalty was reduced by the intercession of certain military officers, who pleaded that, but for him, the Russian army would have perished of hunger.

We must refer our readers to the book to see how the officers themselves suffer under such a system; and how impossible it is to mend it by putting a better man into office instead of a worse. 'It is not enough,' says Prince Dolgoroukow, 'to change 'the men: they are only palliatives at best. The evil grows 'from day to day; and without a complete change of system— 'without a serious reform of institutions — we shall encounter 'a catastrophe which I sadly fear will overwhelm us within a 'very few years.' (P. 259.) In the interval, here is the impression which the Russian soldiers have carried home from the Crimea and the Danube:—

'One day, at a post-house, I met a soldier released from service after the Crimean war. He said to me, "In the Crimea I saw "French and Sardinian soldiers. What happy fellows those are! "They are well fed, and treated kindly and properly; while we often "want the commonest necessaries; we are constantly robbed, and "then beaten by those who rob us."' (*Ibid.*, p. 258.)

Nobody can wonder that, with such a system in full operation, and with a soldiery full of such impressions, the Russian Emperor is indisposed to war. But in such a state of affairs, what can be hoped for serf-emancipation? Before entering upon this subject, we must glance at the Finance question.

The work entitled 'Russia under Alexander II.' which we have also placed at the head of this article, confirms to the fullest extent the view taken by Prince Dolgoroukow of the financial state of the Russian Empire. Europe has yet to learn the frightful exhaustion caused by the campaigns of 1854 and 1855 — the effects of a profuse issue of paper money — the exactions of all kinds made under the name of voluntary contributions — the disastrous consequences of the interruption of trade — and the prostration of foreign credit. Yet it was at the close of this fearful struggle, and when the country had not begun to recover from its effects, that the Russian Government plunged into numerous industrial speculations, pledged its credit to the execution of a vast system of railroad communication, and sold itself to a party of French adventurers! The truth is that the monetary crisis still weighs upon the empire with undiminished gravity, and aggravates all the other difficulties with which Alexander II. has to contend.

The monetary crisis is owing, we are told, to the vast issue of paper money during the war, by which the Finance Minister believed that he was carrying on the war gratis. The resource recommended is a large foreign loan, payable in pounds sterling or francs, under the existing unsettled value of Russian coin (the interest being of course guaranteed to be paid in pounds sterling or francs). Such a loan might have been superseded by the acceptance of Messrs. Rothschilds' offer to buy the St. Petersburg and Moscow railway for cash payment in gold. The offer was refused — not because the sum proposed was far below the official report of its original cost, which all the world knows to have reached a fabulous amount, but because the bureaucracy dread the business-like faculty of Messrs. Rothschild, and the power of exposure which they would obtain, when once they had planted their foot on Russian soil as proprietors of a railway. The commercial crisis is, if possible, more perilous still, because it grows out of deeper causes. The Russians are not, apparently, destined by nature for commerce: or, if they are, they have not yet found it out. They do not travel: they do not know the world: they merely sell, as our author observes, and do not undertake commerce in its proper sense. They have none of the ingenuity, inquisitiveness, or enterprise of the English, Americans, and Dutch. They do not apply themselves

to meet the wants of men in any country. They merely sell what they have; and the buyers draw the profits from the success of the commodity. A trade so apathetically conducted is certain to succumb before many accidents which would be mere trifles in a truly commercial country. The state of the imperial exchequer and of commerce is indeed remarkably Asiatic at present; and, as our author observes (regarding Turkey under its Asiatic aspect): 'If we will go on governing as in Turkey, 'Russia must arrive at the condition of the Ottoman Empire. 'If we would see Russia strong and powerful, we must adopt 'the principles and bases on which civilised polities are erected.'

In 1810, the Emperor Alexander promised that the budget should be made public. For half-a-century the camarilla have contrived to postpone the day which will take from them the fingering at will of the public money. Meantime, one sort of publicity has been preparing for them. Two little books are annually reprinted in Russia, a very small number of copies being thrown off, and carefully deposited with the few persons to whom the truth may be confided — the Emperor and the heads of departments. One of these little books contains a list of rewards granted to military, and the other to civil functionaries, with an account of all the sums of money presented to them at former dates. Prince Dolgoroukow has deposited in a safe place in this country a copy of the edition of 1846, relating to the civil service; and he promises to publish it some day, to show the world how the public money goes in Russia.

In England and France the whole number of inferior functionaries is far better paid than in Russia; yet, so long ago as 1852, when the Russian civil list was much smaller than at present, it exceeded in amount the civil lists of England and France together. While bankruptcy threatens the state more fearfully every year, a new palace is built for every Grand-Duke who marries, the number of Grand-Dukes being naturally always on the increase, so that there may be fifty by the end of the century. The costly travels of the Dowager-Empress and her tribe of attendants are enough of themselves to empty the treasury — a day's lodging and board usually costing from 120*l.* to 160*l.* In the hope that the Dowager-Empress may hear of his book, our author ventures to point out that extravagance of this kind is not the way to win respect in Europe. On the contrary, he says, Europe laughs at such a mode of travelling, as an illustration of Asiatic barbarism. In Russia the lavish expenditure of the imperial family and of functionaries who are known to be spending the income of the state, excites feelings which the Emperor ought to be aware of,

and which several of his exiled subjects are doing their best to communicate to him. Men of all ranks and conditions can see that bankruptcy is spreading from firm to firm, from estate to estate, and through the whole range of occupations in town and country; so that with every day that the exchequer is empty there is less prospect of filling it. Russia is not possessed of what is called national capital. There is a prodigious assemblage of jewels in a palace here and a church there: a few subjects of high rank have the territory and revenue of princes; and a multitude of so-called nobles, who are not a real aristocracy, have broad lands, occupied by thousands of serfs: merchants are pointed out here and there as very wealthy; and government contractors and unscrupulous men in office parade their gains before the world: but all this affords no secure basis for national finance — no resource against the threatened bankruptcy, because it is not supported by an accumulated capital in the hands of a middle class, constantly affording employment and sufficient wages to a working-class which has an open career before it. In a highly civilised country, where industry is free, and capital thoroughly diffused, it is of less consequence to prosperous finance to economise the expenditure of the state than to raise an ample revenue from a well-organised community: but in a semi-barbarous state like the Russian, where there is no organisation of classes, but, on the contrary, an increasing tendency to part more widely asunder, there is no hope of saving the national credit but by vigorous retrenchment of unprofitable expenditure, in the first place; and then interesting the greatest number of citizens by publicity, so that all may know the needs and dangers of the state. The further question of how to raise the means to carry on the national business will then pass from the hands of an interested clique into those of the citizens, noble and plebeian, gentle and simple, who care for their country. At best, the rescue must be difficult enough: and no one can wonder that Prince Dolgoroukow and many other patriotic Russians apprehend a fearful catastrophe as long as they see the financial affairs of the empire confided to an irresponsible executive which refuses to bring its work to the daylight.

The spirit (corn brandy) duty in Russia, farmed out, yields two-fifths of the revenue of the state. Last year it produced 19,200,000*l.* The farmer of the tax lays on a great addition to the legal price of the spirit; and to secure connivance, he bribes all the local officials. To repay himself his expenditure of hundreds or thousands a year in bribes, and to make the people drink as much brandy as they would if it

bore the legal price, all conceivable devices of intimidation and seduction are employed to get a certain quantity of brandy down men's throats, and up in score against them. When once they are sufficiently deep in debt there is no fear of their turning temperate; and their earnings are mortgaged for life to the exchequer, and to the farmer of its most lucrative tax. The freeman is induced to run up a score; and he is enormously overcharged. The peasant is induced to do the same, and his creditor comes down upon him with a heavy bill at harvest time. Having no ready money, he is compelled to give up a very undue portion of his crop. If a man who has no interest among the great comes to a publichouse in a cart, he is soon dead drunk; and when he comes to himself, cart and horse have disappeared. If he has come on foot, part of his clothes have vanished; and the bill charges him with much more drink than he can possibly have swallowed. Dupes are constantly becoming thieves, getting back their losses by duping others in the ways they have such good reason to understand. There are no fouler nests of crime than these publichouses; laws and ordinances never enter them. The farmers of the brandy-duty keep the police in their pay; and the police never interfere where the sale of brandy is going on.

In 1838 a report spread beyond the Russian frontier that the serfs were instituting Temperance Societies. They had in fact become aware of the use which had been made of them by corrupt officials, high and low. In increasing numbers they forswore spirit-drinking till brandy should be good at a moderate price; and some of them repaired to their churches to ask the Divine blessing on this strangely limited vow. As they experienced and manifested the happy effects of sobriety, their example spread, till the contractors and the bureaucracy were in a panic for the revenue. Bribes were freely dispensed; the police were set to employ all their arts: but the highest officers of government had to act before the Temperance movement could be checked. Three ministers, those of the Interior, of Finance, and of the Crown Lands, undertook the odious work of remanding the people to sottishness. They issued a circular to all the provincial authorities, declaring that spirit-drinking was necessary to the popular health; and that no associations could be formed without the sanction of Government, which had no Temperance Societies on its list. Temperance Societies were therefore prohibited. This circular bore the seal of secrecy which, in Russia as elsewhere, stimulates curiosity; and everybody in the empire soon knew its contents; while abroad the attempt at concealment deepened the contempt

with which such an act was regarded. During last year riots broke out wherever the crusade against temperance was vigorously carried on. The police stood over the peasants in the publichouses, and by force of blows compelled them to drink brandy; then the exasperated peasants demolished the publichouses. This brought down upon them troops in such numbers that the news went forth throughout Europe that the Russian army was engaged in sustaining the brandy-duty at the expense of the national sobriety; and again, as a consequence of this, the bureaucracy obtained an order that the censorship should not allow the appearance of any publication which in the slightest degree referred to the immorality of the management of the brandy-duty.

In all that we have said thus far we have had in view the Emperor's enterprise of emancipating the serfs; and if our readers are impressed by these facts as we are, they will have made up their minds that a sovereign so served cannot achieve such a work by any other means than a complete reform of the administrative system; and by also enlarging, ascertaining, and confirming the liberties of every other class of society, as well as the lowest. A nobility which, till 1762, was subject to the knout, and afterwards to many indignities, — a commonalty which is still subject to the stick, and has no security for any rights,—cannot help the Emperor to free the serfs in any safe, permanent, and substantial way; and when we see how the degradation of society is expressly and irresistibly promoted by the Imperial Government itself, we become intensely curious to know how the Emperor can really suppose that he is to complete the enterprise which is the nearest of all things to his heart.

The most important considerations in the case are the disposition of the highest authority, and the character of the serfs. If the Emperor is at once enlightened and resolute in his purpose, and if the serfs are capable of freedom, it seems as if no intervening powers could baffle them. Nobody doubts the sincerity of the Emperor; but there is, and at present must be, doubt whether he has the sagacious boldness to do the work in the only practicable way. While the bureaucracy and the camarilla occupy the seats of power, before or behind the curtain, nothing will be done, and every day deepens the peril of a war of classes.

As to the other great question — the character of the class he desires to emancipate — the case is certainly more hopeful than any on record in which the subjugated class has belonged to masters and owners of a different race. The serfs of Russia have the vices of slaves—cunning, lying, laziness in ordinary life,

and a proneness to sensual indulgence. This is inevitable. The posterity of the most free spirited Briton would sooner or later become sly and false, sensual and lazy, if subjected to centuries of corporal punishment, of forced labour, of subjection to the caprices of absolute owners, and of aggression on his domestic relations. But there is no evidence that these vices are anything more than the inevitable consequences of slavery. They are not universal; they are not incorrigible; and such evidence as we can obtain seems to show that, in Russia as elsewhere, the more nearly the enthralled classes approach freedom the more fit they become for freedom. They were once as free as their neighbours—whether that be saying much or little; and there is nothing in their present mental and moral condition which discourages the belief that they will be very like their neighbours after living for some time under the same conditions. They are certainly capable of something much higher than the brute-like attachment to their owners which is often vaunted as the highest virtue of slaves. They can be faithful to their engagements as well as to their masters: they can be industrious for the sake of their children, when they would not toil hard for a proprietor: they can deny themselves brandy when they perceive an end to be gained by the sacrifice: and, above all, they have set their minds on being free, which is an all-sufficient reason for their being made so. Those who venture upon trifling with that particular aspiration must be responsible for turning the victims from the right road to freedom into that of rebellion and murder. It should be eternally remembered what came of the few words of the Emperor Nicholas to a deputation of serfs who asked liberty of him. 'I think much of you, and 'sympathise with you,' he said. They spread the news abroad that they would soon be free—for what could not the Czar's sympathy do? When the emancipation did not arrive, some lost patience; and near a certain wooded shore of the Volga, on an estate where provocations were too frequent, the peasants seized the bailiff and those of the household who were on the spot, and put them to death in the diabolical ways that are well understood in slaveholding countries, but always reluctantly described elsewhere. The present Emperor has done more than say that he thinks much of the serfs, and sympathises with them; and nothing can be graver than the risk of needless delay.

The question which includes the whole prospect, and we might say the whole future of Russia, is—whether the Emperor is aware of what he is undertaking in abolishing serfage? Thus far, he has not even had recourse to new men. Is

he aware that the official system must be built up from a new foundation, organised by a new method, and composed of a different kind of men from those who consider office their right on certain conditions? Is he decided to destroy the bureaucracy, and leave not a fragment of it in the public offices? Perhaps he has heard of the eight or nine hundred serfs who were assembled by their owner on his estate in the government of Koursk, in December, 1857, informed by him of the Emperor's purpose in regard to their class, and requested to consult on the best way of effecting the change in their condition. Their first answer was that they were happy, and desired no change: but when the newspapers announced the fact, which perhaps they had hardly received before, they did consult. They came to a conclusion which they communicated by a delegation to their owner;—that they entreated him to keep them as they were, because if they were free they would be under the police, which was the greatest of all misfortunes. Thus, under the existing official system, the serfs themselves would not thank the Emperor for liberty, while it would be a bold thing to say that a Russian Emperor could depose the bureaucracy, and establish a body of functionaries disposed to be honest, and enlightened enough to manage a wholly new social system. Is the Emperor aware that he proposes to substitute a new foundation for the whole structure of Russian society? Has he reflected that in all countries of advanced civilisation, land is the basis of property, and therefore of all institutions which relate to property; while in Russia, and wherever slavery exists, the land is regarded as valueless, but for the slaves which are upon it. In Russia, a man's property is reckoned by the 'souls' he possesses; and in the American slave States by the 'hands' on his estate. The moment the 'souls' and 'hands' become men and not property, the land rises in value, and is soon worth more than the human chattels upon it ever were: but the transfer of the value from the people to the soil is a revolution of the most radical character in a country like Russia, where the serfs form so vast an element as they do in the thin population of the largest empire in the world. In the United States, the thing may be done, as has been proved, by giving wages to negroes, instead of subsistence, as wages are given to other labourers; and the slaves are only four millions in a population of above twenty-seven millions. In Russia, free labour is a thing unknown: neither owners nor serfs have examples before their eyes to guide themselves by; and the serfs of individual proprietors (sometimes called slaves to distinguish them from the Crown peasants), were computed

to be, in 1847, not less than twelve millions. At that time, the *unfree* of all orders, from the house-slave on an estate to the rich unenfranchised trader of the capital, were 86½ per cent. of the male population of the empire. Has the Emperor considered that this vast majority of his subjects has scarcely a notion of the individual unfettered proprietorship of land at all? Still less can they distinguish between property and occupation: a Russian peasant conceives his cottage and garden to be his own, though he is well aware that he belongs in his own person to a master. These changes involve a social and moral revolution as grave as other countries have gone through in a course of centuries.

Thus far the measures taken by the Russian Government are confined to setting the proprietors to work to free their respective serfs, under the guidance of Provincial Councils, assembled for that object, and to communicate any views on the subject which they may entertain. Moreover the Emperor has lately appointed to the Chair of the Commission, vacated by the death of M. Rostovtsow, one of the most inveterate anti-reformers in his dominions, — the Minister of Justice, — who punishes every man within his reach who points out an abuse. Prince Dolgoroukow says this is dancing on to a revolution, — wantonly braving shipwreck. It is at least evidence that the Emperor is unaware of the scope of his enterprise. So far from this being any reason against his persevering with it, it is a proof of the urgent necessity of the reform. The necessity has become more urgent from reign to reign; and now the civilisation of the world outside of Russia, and both the internal condition and external relations of the empire, forbid further delay. The question is simply between perdition and the creation of a new system of property and labour. A free trade in corn and the railway system, as M. Wolowski points out, render the existing Russian system impracticable. Prince Dolgoroukow shows us (p. 93.) how, in the calmness of strength, the superior serfs are awaiting their emancipation, declining every proposal of partial release, on terms of compulsory labour, and rejecting with contempt the invitation of owners, who have tried to keep them ignorant of what is going on, to purchase themselves on easy terms. The more resolute these waiting serfs are, the more precarious is the Emperor's reliance on them as the material of his army. Till this question is settled he cannot go to war; both because he must be uncertain of a supply of trustworthy soldiers, and because no national wealth can grow up to support the expenses of war. The late war proved the true state of the case; and considerations which then could not be evaded now

press with the force of a fatality. The Emperor must go on, well or ill prepared in knowledge and foresight. If the empire is to be saved from being crushed between eastern barbarism and western civilisation, it is in this way; though the most patriotic men are not the most hopeful, from the conduct of the enterprise thus far.

The history of the institution of Russian serfage is briefly this, according to one or other of the authors before us.

M. Wolowski believes slavery to be ancient in Russia, as elsewhere. The people were nomad in their way of life; and when, in course of time, it became necessary to till the soil, which nomad races will never do, prisoners of war, debtors, and other helpless persons who were in the power of the strong, were made cultivators by force. This is partly speculation, but the 10th century supplies us with a fact. In the most ancient code of Russian laws, of that date, the code of Jaroslav, society was marked out into three classes; the first class being composed of nobles, the second of freemen, and the third of domestic slaves, who had no civil rights at all. A man might be made a slave under five conditions; but there is nothing in these particulars which shows that the cultivators of the soil were then slaves; and on this point there is a difference of opinion among historical students. The provision that the posterity of slaves shall constitute an inheritance, like the increase of the cattle on the estate, may apply to house slaves; and it certainly appears, from M. Tourgueneff's historical sketch, that when our Queen Elizabeth was reigning, the labouring classes of Russia were personally free, though various civic liberties had long been overthrown. At so late a time as ten years before the accession of James I. to the Crown of England, the first restriction was imposed on the Russian labourer's power of choosing his employer. The Czar Boris decreed, in 1592, and followed up his decree by a law, that labourers should not remove from the estate on which they were employed. The labourer was attached to the soil; and the act was done to gratify the small proprietors from whom Boris recruited his army. The law rendered a census necessary; and the census led to a further encroachment on the working class. In 1597 it was forbidden to servants engaged under contract to leave their service on the expiration of the contract; and it was permitted to employers to appropriate as bond-servants any labourers who had been with them longer than six months. The excuse for these changes was that the migration of workers injured work, and that the labourers themselves were disappointed and soured by finding that they had not improved their condition by shifting their

place. By 1601 the class had become so discontented that some safety-valve was indispensable; and two serfs from each estate of the small proprietors were allowed to try for a change of masters for fifteen days of each year. St. George's Day was the time; and hence the melancholy Russian proverb by which the breaking up of an illusion is called 'a St. George's Day.' It was easily contrived that a valuable serf should not find another master, or should suffer by a change for the worse.

Next came the confusion between the house and the land serfs in regard to sale of their persons. Whatever the laws might say as to this, field labourers were in fact sold, more and more freely, as time passed on; and no retribution followed. It was hard to say what the law was, while the orders of each successive sovereign were registered as laws, without method or facility of reference; and to this day it is scarcely possible for the Emperor to learn, with any certainty, what the law is on any subject. If there is a task more difficult still, it is to get his own decrees put into practice. It was so with Peter the Great, and it is so with Alexander II. Peter was so shocked at finding that 'men were sold like cattle, — parents being separated from their 'children, and husbands and wives from each other, — a thing,' he added, 'which causes tears to flow,' — that he commanded his Senate to make a law to prevent it. The law would have been inconvenient, and it was never made. The Empress Catherine expressed her sensibility on the institution, and issued a mandate to an academy of learned men to discuss the subject, and publish their views on emancipation. A dissertation was published: but the courtiers, while mingling their regrets with those of the sovereign, found, as usual, that schemes which do honour to the heart were impracticable. They dared not say precisely that; but they asked time for consideration, and the subject was dropped. The same sovereign actually emulated Boris, when she visited a part of her empire which had never belonged to Boris. She was persuaded to decree, on visiting Little Russia, that the labourers should be attached to the soil on which they were then at work. The instigators of this act, aware of what was to happen, offered unusual inducements to labourers from all quarters to work on their estates in Little Russia; and there the poor dupes were caught in a trap by the proclamation. They could never go home, and found themselves slaves. One courtier, a member of the Council of State, obtained the favour of having two fine regiments of grenadiers encamped on his land at the critical moment; and he incorporated them with his agricultural serfs. This was the Empress Catherine's way of dealing with an institution which she professed to lament.

Paul was beset with petitions to authorise the sale of serfs as merchandise, on the ground that there was a duty on them in the tariff; but he replied, 'Peasants may not be sold apart from 'the land on which they live.'

Alexander was the first of the Czars who entertained the idea of a genuine and complete emancipation. His predecessors had proposed more or less alleviation of the lot of the serf; but the conception of a free labouring class was beyond them. The narrative presented to us by M. Tourgueneff of Alexander's course in regard to this question is extremely interesting. On his accession he declared that he would never give away, as presents, or acknowledgment of services, estates, with the peasants upon them, as his grandmother and father had done. Some wretched men who had been carried off from their homes, and sold into the hard service of a Scotch engineer, who had become a noble in the Imperial service, found means to address the Emperor when he was at a Congress at Aix-la-Chapelle. The Emperor forwarded the petition to his Council, with an autograph letter in which he declared his astonishment at the perpetration of such an act, in defiance of the law. There was much discussion of the law and the fact; and the matter ended in the practice being declared illegal, but allowed to continue. There were commissions of lawyers and statesmen, and they loitered over their work till the Emperor forgot the whole affair. In the very midst of it, when the President of the Council was ordered to take home and consider the most approved scheme, he quizzed the simple people who supposed the Emperor to believe that twenty years later men would not be sold in detail on his own estates. In the very midst of it, too, a woman was sold for two roubles and a-half, within two paces of the Emperor's palace gates. While such things were said and done without his knowledge, he was cherishing the belief that he had a mission to make these people free. In a fit of enthusiasm he one day seized a sacred image from a marble shelf, and made a vow before it to abolish serfage. But, as we have seen, he forgot it; and when, towards the close of his reign, Count Woronzoff and other great proprietors desired to carry out the work, they found that the Emperor had retrograded in his views as they had advanced. All this is very interesting at the moment when we are watching the policy of another humane Emperor Alexander.

It was in that reign, however, that a partial experiment was instituted in some outlying provinces, whose proceedings were little heard of in the old empire. In the provinces of Esthonia, Livonia, and Courland, the slavery of the cultivators had been more complete than in the rest of the empire; but the work of

emancipation had begun towards the close of the last century; and the idea was so diffused through society, that the result was only a question of time. The history of the experiment is given in a very interesting form in M. Wolowski's third paper on the subject of serfage ('Revue des Deux Mondes, Septembre, 1858'). We can here say only that the experiment proves the necessity of beginning by other social reforms, involving changes in the whole social structure; and that the troubles which arose in the course of the experiment, and which continue at this day, are indisputably owing to the partial character of the liberation of the working-class, who were not only bound by onerous contracts, but restricted from change of abode till population had reached a certain point, whatever their hardships might be in the interval. The inevitable evil of all such cases, the pride and tyranny of the proprietary class, and their antipathy to an order of men who were once their property, still causes perpetual discontent and occasional turbulence which time only can extinguish; but it is thoroughly understood that these evils are trifles in comparison with what must have arisen if the former servitude had been prolonged. M. Wolowski sums up thus:—

'The situation of Esthonia and Livonia was, before the promulgation of the liberating ordinances, even more unhappy than that of the rest of the serfs of the Russian empire, and the difficulties of emancipation were greater than in any other part of the imperial dominions. Yet the reform was achieved without convulsion or violence; the juridical separation between the soil and its cultivators took place, if not with all the benefit that was anticipated, at least without the perils which were threatened. It was in one of the Baltic provinces, Courland, that the best understanding prevailed of the general need of establishing and maintaining, on an equitable and moderate basis, the relations, henceforth free, between the proprietor and the cultivator of the soil. Thus the abolition of serfage was approved by all, nobles and peasants alike, though the feudal character of the legislation, and the prohibition of the removal of the peasant from one province to another impeded the reform so as to deprive it of full success. Agriculture is now prosperous; the condition of the cultivators is good; and the farmers especially are in a position of remarkable ease. The artisans profit by a continuous rise of wages. In virtue of free contracts, forced labour has everywhere disappeared, giving place to rent, properly so called,—ground-rent, paid in money. It is satisfactory to be able to establish, by the recent example of Courland, the beneficent effects of the suppression of serfage, as a decisive precedent for Russia. Russia can do more and better than what has been done in the Baltic provinces, without running any serious risk.' (*La Question du Servage en Russie*, p. 422.)

In going on to show that the suffering and discontent which

still exist are not owing to the emancipation of the labouring class, M. Wolowski however confirms the view of Prince Dolgoroukow that fundamental changes in other institutions must precede or steadily accompany the treatment of the case of the serfs.

The Emperor Alexander permitted this reform in the Baltic provinces, but he was anxious to keep the matter so quiet as that it should not be heard of in Russia Proper; and when some of the wealthiest, wisest, and best of his nobles some years afterwards associated themselves to carry on the same reform throughout his dominions, the Emperor, on whose sanction and actual promise they relied, objected to their mutual co-operation. He had meantime become possessed with a dread of association in any form. 'Why associate?' he asked. 'Why cannot each of you 'do what he thinks best on his own estate?' And this was the end of his boasted mission to emancipate the serfs of Russia.

The Emperor Nicholas sincerely desired to improve the condition of the serfs; and he proved it by various schemes of mitigation, which only deferred the change that even he, with his narrow capacity, knew to be inevitable. The one idea which he was always unable to admit was that of liberty; and he could not see that liberty was in this case the sole end and the sole means. His efforts and devices only irritated the proprietors, and kept up a dangerous excitement among the peasants of all classes. More and more of the Crown peasants were freed from the old terms of bondage to pass under another which was called a tax; but, as there was no reform of the administration before or during the change, this tax is so managed by his functionaries as to constitute a worse bondage than that from which the peasants were delivered. His celebrated ukase of 1842 was a hopeless endeavour to reconcile serfage and liberty by a form of contract between proprietors and their peasants, which left the power in the hands of the proprietors, while it roused their suspicions and fears. It was, in some cases, a benefit to substitute a contract for a fixed term for the arbitrary will of the proprietors; but authority was still the whole agency and the whole sanction; and the *paysans obligés* were no more masters of themselves than before. This was, however, an innovation on the system; and, inasmuch as it led to discussion of the subject, it might be a benefit. But when the nobles took the alarm, and became clamorous about revolution, the Emperor's own ministers reminded them that the measure was merely permissive, and that the power of instituting these contracts remained with the proprietors alone. So well was this explained, that in two cases only is the experiment known to have been

tried. The European troubles of 1848 closed the Emperor's mind against all proposals of enlarging anybody's liberties; and when the late war broke out, it was understood throughout the empire that the question of serf-emancipation was shelved.

In Mr. Shirley Brooks' little volume on 'The Russians of the 'South,' we have a fuller, more lively, lifelike, and thorough representation of the mind and manners of proprietors and serfs than, as far as our knowledge goes, exists anywhere else. He visited Russia towards the close of the last reign (the date of his book is 1854), and had opportunities, of which he made the most, of becoming acquainted with the working of the system by his own observation. He obtained the confidence of many proprietors, lived with them on their estates, conversed with serfs of all varieties, and with functionaries in all the departments which are concerned with the rural system; and the broad and clear light which he casts on the relations now so anxiously studied by all the world is of the highest value, in connexion with the disquisitions supplied by Russian patriots, self-exiled in order to publish the truths which they cannot utter at home. At the time when the Emperor Nicholas was understood to have given up his schemes and his hopes, Mr. Brooks found many proprietors convinced, as their fathers were before them, that all the projects of all the Czars on behalf of the peasants were devised to sow distrust and ill-will between the serfs and their owners; and that when such schemes were shelved, it was because proprietors talked of managing the affair on their own behalf, terrifying the autocrat of the day with the prospect of a co-operation which would give too much power to the subjects of an absolute sovereign.

Such was the state of men's minds on this great question when Nicholas was about to leave his throne to another. There were no roads, properly speaking; and the holes in the tracks were filled up with the manure which ought to have been put upon the land, but which the proprietors were only anxious to get rid of. There was enormous waste of time and bullock-draught in conveying grain to Odessa by such tracks; but the corn was in no hurry, and bullock-draught was cheap. Proprietors were in debt, and the serfs suffered for it; but both parties would get through life somehow, and posterity must take care of the rest. Injustice was perpetrated every hour: crime, and rage, and fear abounded: but worse things might come of a change; and to defer the change was the first object with every landowner. Then came the war, with its exposure of the hollowness of the whole system. Then came a new sovereign, reputed absolute in power, and therefore adored by all the weak in his dominions,

but well known by the camarilla and the bureaucracy to have no power which they could not use or thwart, as it might suit them. And next followed the memorable avowal of January, and proclamation of December 1857, which pledged the will and word of the autocrat for the full and complete emancipation of all the serfs in the empire.

This pledge, either noble or rash in the highest degree, was thrown out over the heads of society in Russia, though society must do the work. That society has no effective powers because it has no natural organisation. It has no aristocracy, properly so called; for the nobles of Russia have never been anything but the creatures and the slaves of the autocrats,— till recently possessed of no rights, and now not daring to claim such rights as have been occasionally granted to them. For the offence of asserting one of these rights, Prince Dolgoroukow himself was visited by an imperial physician, in the time of Nicholas, in order to ascertain whether his brain was not affected; and when it was declared sane, he was banished to Viatka, where he had refused to go as a functionary. The nobles never had any attachment to the Romanoff family, whose line became extinct on the throne of Russia at the death of Peter II., and neither can they have any loyal affections towards the reigning house of Holstein-Gottorp, because they are individually overshadowed by the power of the princes, as the serfs are by their masters. Neither are they united among themselves; nor do they command the devotion of their peasants. Loyalty does not exist among or in regard to them; they have no ancestral privileges, no hard-won liberties, no political function, no hereditary honours. Called nobles, they are in no sense an aristocracy. In Russian society there is no middle class; for the merchants and professional men are not bound together by any common duty, pursuit, interest, or hope. Each order, which would form a class elsewhere, is a mere rope of sand. The vast remainder consists of serfs. This is the society over whose heads the Emperor has made proclamation of the work which he wills society to achieve.

What has been done, thus far? Alexander II. came to the throne on the 2nd of March (N.S.), 1855. From time to time we heard that he was showing the same dispositions in favour of the serfs which marked the opening of the reigns of his uncle and father; and in January 1857 the announcement was made that a committee was appointed at St. Petersburg, to consider and report upon a project of emancipation. After ten months, when no progress had been made by this committee, the Emperor roused the interest of Europe and America in the case by

his proclamation in reply to the petition of the proprietors in some frontier provinces, to be allowed to free their serfs in their own way, they having in their immediate neighbourhood the example of a successful experiment in the provinces of Prussia. The Emperor authorised them to form their own committees and proceed in their own way, and extended the permission to all the provinces of the empire. The wise men at St. Petersburg saw that they must pretend to be doing something, though the greater number of them were averse to all change. The next thing we heard of was a virtuous enthusiasm on the part of the nobles generally for 'the amelioration of the condition of 'the serfs.' This opened a vast field of talk, and offered admirable opportunity for delay. The Emperor intimated that he did not propose to alleviate but to abolish serfage; and, when the Central Committee was evidently at a stand, having got no further than to issue a report craftily unfavourable to emancipation, he appointed another for the special purpose of drawing up a practical plan for converting serfs into freemen. When he had himself attended the Central Committee to see how the affair got on, and had announced three conditions on which any scheme must proceed in the provinces, the world began to consider the thing virtually done. In January 1858 there was a banquet at Moscow, when 180 proprietors poured out their praises of the Emperor for conceiving the idea of this great reform, which had long been impeded only by the 'apathy' of the landowners generally. In March we had General Mouravieff's speech at Nijni Novogorod, which showed that the whole work still remained to be done. Then, provincial nobles began to flock to St. Petersburg, declaring that they were afraid for their lives on their own estates: and next, the Emperor's own committees addressed to him demands for the increase of other liberties than those of the serfs, which filled the Court with alarm, and which threatened the Emperor with the embarrassment of having two revolutions at once upon his hands. Since that time we have heard of his occasional addresses to the serf-holding class, in the course of his journeys through the provinces; and we have observed that declarations of his settled will and fixed purpose are never absent from such speeches and proclamations: yet it is evident to all the world that nothing is yet done. The camarilla and the bureaucracy know very well that the project has not advanced one step, and they intend very decidedly that it never shall in their time. Such are the consequences of going to work with old tools in a new period, and of beginning reform at the wrong end. The patriotic men who, understanding all this from their youth up-

wards, have gone to a distance to speak the truth, have each a scheme to propose; and the best wish that can be formed for the Emperor and all his subjects is, that what those writers say publicly may be read, however privately, throughout Russia. The censorship is always at work to prevent their books being seen, or even heard of; but all that they write is nevertheless read in every province of the empire. If we were sure that the camarilla did not keep these writings out of the sight of the Imperial family, we should have some hope that the work might at last be taken up at the right end, and carried through.

An incident which occurred last autumn almost excludes any hope of the kind. Deputies from provincial committees were last year sent up to consult with the Second Committee at St. Petersburg, whose business it was to frame a practical scheme; but the alarm of the Court about publicity, and about any mode of assembly, precluded everything beyond mere private discussion. Finding this, five of the deputies, men of experience in that provincial life which is so little understood at St. Petersburg, addressed the Emperor himself. This was in October last, when it might be thought he had waited long enough for practical assistance, and would be grateful for the guidance he in vain asked for from his own committees. But the suggestions tendered were unwelcome to the camarilla, and the five deputies were visited with an imperial reprimand for their 'unjust and 'inappropriate pretensions.' The address was thoroughly loyal in its spirit and tone; its offence was in the facts and reasonings on which its conclusions were based. These were summed up in four recommendations, which could not be acceptable to the clique then at the Emperor's ear. The necessary conditions of emancipation are, according to this authority, — 1st, that the serfs should be set free on small freeholds, for which the former proprietors should be indemnified by the state; 2nd, that all local administration, thrown open to all classes, should be based on the elective principle; 3rd, that the administration of justice should be reorganised, and be independent of executive authority, which should indeed be amenable to the courts, and that a public and oral procedure, and jury trial, should be introduced; 4th, that liberty of the press, with safeguards against abuse, should be established, in order that malversations and abuses might become known in the highest quarters.

Such were the terms proposed in the best way and by the best advisers: and they were rejected with displeasure last October. This does not look very promising. We may easily conceive the horror with which the Emperor and his courtiers would read the assurance that the only choice lay between

emancipation under these conditions, and emancipation by fire and slaughter. To reprimand the advisers was the shortest way of putting such an alternative out of sight.

What, then, does the Emperor suppose he has to do? There are upwards of 44,000,000 of the class called 'souls' in the empire, the half of whom are Crown and Appanage peasants, while the other half are private property. The change of proportion between the Crown and Proprietory peasants within the present century, is a consequence of the system which impoverishes the proprietors. They mortgage their serfs to government for advances of capital with which to carry on their operations; and, as they are seldom or never able to repay these advances, their serfs pass over into the possession of the Crown. Let it be considered that the peasants and serfs of Russia are nearly double the population of Great Britain, and that free society in European Russia consists of only 13,000,000.

The difficulty of emancipation of course relates to the half of the serf property which is held by individual proprietors. It may surprise some of our readers to learn that these owners are only about 116,000 in number. Giving them the largest family connexion, the whole interest can hardly amount to three quarters of a million of persons. Yet this small portion of the free society of the empire holds as property the twenty-two millions of serfs who constitute half the labouring class, the other half being the property, or in the power, of the Crown and the Imperial family. Of these 116,000 proprietors, 5000 have no land. They possess 30,000 serfs, employing them as house-slaves, or letting them out. At the other end of the scale there are 1447 who are more like princes than subject nobles, owning more than 6,500,000 of serfs. In this division all are included who possess more than 2000 serfs. Those who own from 1000 to 2000 serfs are about 2500; nearly 20,000 hold from 100 to 1000 serfs, or nearly 8,000,000 in all. These rich classes are not the most difficult to deal with. The bitterest enemies of emancipation (for its own sake) are the poorer land-owners, who squeeze all they can out of their dependents, and who will not tolerate any mention of giving land to the peasants to settle down upon. Above 36,000 of these hold from 20 to 100 serfs each, or about 3,250,000 altogether. The most miserable serfs of all are said to belong to the remaining 50,000 owners, who are the poorest of the landowners, possessing fewer than 21 serfs.

The rural system is a remarkable and unmanageable compound, as M. Wolowski points out, of an aristocratic *régime*, in which work is degrading and a mere humiliation, and a

communistic system, in which the conception of private property hardly exists. The peasant on a rich noble's estate pays rent; that is, he cultivates the land of the settlement, and pays a fixed portion of what he earns to his owner, and maintains his family on the rest. But his labour is not his own; and the land can hardly be said to be at his master's disposal. The land and the labour, and such capital as may be forthcoming, are all jumbled together, to afford a subsistence to the people who live upon the spot; the whole, including the people themselves, being the property of the noble, while the peasants are living under a veritable socialism, as far as they themselves see. The problem is, to introduce them to the ideas and feelings which belong to the possession of private property, and the free disposal of a man's own industry. The question is, how such a transfer from the ideas and habits of an ancient to a modern century can be best effected, supposing the change itself to be no matter of choice. It is pretty clear to everybody, unless it be the Emperor himself, that it cannot be done by means of an official hierarchy which is, at every stage, opposed to the attempt altogether. It is plain that some sort of political existence must be granted to all the parties concerned, from the rich noble to the humble serf who shrinks with dread from the thought of being unprotected from the police. It is plain that law and justice must be present everywhere, set before all men's eyes, and within all men's reach, or some men will not work, and others will not pay, and society will be, even more than at present, at the mercy of the most violent or the most corrupt.

We have seen that the best qualified advisers on the spot have no encouragement to propose a scheme. Let us see what are the views of economists, who, from the stand-point of London and Paris, see their country as a whole, and can watch the evolution of its fate.

M. Wolowski is for trusting everything to the broad principle and frank gift of liberty. The main dread of the proprietors is of a deficiency of labour, in a country where land is a drug, and the labour upon it is, by the associations of centuries, the only wealth. This is met by the equally obstinate association in the peasant mind that the labourers cannot be separated from the land. As they have always belonged to the land, they argue that the land belongs to them. The dwellings which they have built with their own hands, and the furniture and garden-stock which they have acquired by their own industry, and have always called their own, they will, under a new system, consider their own, so as to be unable to conceive that they

must pay for them: but this purchase is a necessary condition of the liberty to remove; and that liberty of movement is the main feature of emancipation. The general features of the new scheme ought thus to be that the peasants may purchase their dwellings and plot of ground, but not be compelled to settle on the land if they desire to devote themselves to handicrafts. It will be the interest of proprietors to make liberal terms for the purchase of dwellings and land, in order to induce the peasants to remain. On the other hand, the contracts for redemption must not extend over so long a period of time as to form, in fact, a system of compulsory labour: there must be banking or other credit establishments which will enable the peasants to raise money for a speedy liquidation of their debt: and the labour due should take the form of piecework, wherever practicable, instead of being measured by days, which encourages idleness, and a waste of time and effort. There must be guarantees for the peasants' rights. Hitherto justice, administration, and the police have all been in the hands of the proprietors; and there must be a new social organisation, under which all orders will be equal before the law. This view is recommended in preference to any scheme which should assign land to every peasant, the proprietors being compensated from the public treasury: a scheme which would create a vast system of credit such as would depreciate, and in every way disturb, the natural values of land and labour, and create insuperable financial difficulties. Under a system of entire personal liberty, time would certainly equalise the supply of labour in the various departments of industry: and meanwhile the labouring class would be hourly learning the meaning and value of personal freedom as a condition and exponent of private property, while the obligations which remained to be fulfilled would be understood to be the attribute of citizenship, and not the badge of slavery. This view, like every other which contemplates a real emancipation, involves a thorough reform of the administrative system of the empire.

Under this scheme the working of emancipation rests with the proprietors. M. Tourgueneff would allow the proprietors and their peasants to make their own terms, under the guidance of the main principles of the plan; but he considers that the Government must undertake and carry through the work as a whole, security being taken by the principles of the enterprise that the proprietory serfs shall be raised to the theoretical condition of the Crown and Appanage peasants, instead of the latter being in any degree lowered towards the condition of the Proprietory peasants. M. Tourgueneff's view of a redemption

scheme is that the redemption should be paid by the proprietors who have held men as property, and not by the serfs who have been too long injured already. It would never do to flood the market with promises to pay on the security of land, which is no security at all, because it is inconvertible. It should be in the form of assignments of land, the inconvertibility of land being a safe guarantee of the peasant's possession. The portions of land must not be so large as to maintain a peasant's household; for this would leave the labour-market bare. A third part of the proprietor's estate should be compulsorily assigned to the commune (where communes exist), the peasants' plots being included in this assignment. Where communes do not exist, the same proportion should be given, either as absolute property or for the usufruct of the peasants, Government deciding how this land should be distributed among the late serfs, and seeing the plan carried out, without participation on the part of the peasants. In all cases the dwellings and their plots of ground should be the absolute property of the inhabitant. The re-arrangement of the land should be accomplished within a year; and at the end of two years every right of the proprietor over his late serfs would be held to have expired; the peasants would have become free citizens, subject to the general laws of society, and to any special enactments which should have been framed on their account. Their late proprietors at the same time would cease to be responsible for any taxes chargeable on the peasants, and for their maintenance. Domestic and personal serfs, who stand on the register of the estate, might claim to belong to the commune, and to share its advantages and obligations, if they proffered their claim within a year. Those who should make no such claim must choose some occupation, and enter themselves on the registers of the towns. The rest of the plan relates to the dealings of Government with regard to the debts on estates mortgaged by proprietors to the Councils charged with carrying out the scheme; and to the aid in money to be afforded by Government, in exceptional cases, to proprietors whose estates are not so mortgaged.

M. Tourgueneff would not at present interfere with the constitution and working of the communes, because by attempting too much the whole enterprise might miscarry. He would, however, unite these small communes so as to form cantons of about 15,000 inhabitants, which may hereafter be organised under such a system as the communes in France, and parishes in England; and these may at length serve as the basis of the general administration of the empire. As, in an elective system

in the communes, where the members would manage their affairs and choose their own officers, the proprietors would be reduced far below their proper rate of influence; and as they cannot at present conceive of equality before the law, they should be allowed a direct appeal to the authorities of the district, who should be bound to assist them in all cases of reasonable complaint or demand. The several administrations which now manage the different classes of serfs and peasants should merge in one, when all the orders become alike free, the new administration being based on the proposed cantons. The administration, in its management of local taxation, recruiting, roads, police, &c., should pay regard to local methods so far as to have the system sit easy on those who should live under it. These are the chief points of M. Tourguéneff's plan; and there is a strong moral interest in listening to him, as he did not wait for the Imperial command to give freedom to the serfs on his own estate. It is evident that here again a radical change in the constitution of Russian society is shown to be involved in the scheme of emancipation; a revolution which the Councils at St. Petersburg are not at all likely to effect, and which the Emperor himself can hardly be supposed to have ever contemplated.

Prince Dolgoroukow introduces his scheme by reminding us that the present dilemma is the same as that of a thousand years since, but with a more certain and fearful catastrophe at hand than the more primitive age could produce.

'Ten centuries ago, in 862, the slaves of the north sent ambassadors to Rurik, and to his brothers, to say: "Our country is vast and fer-"tile, but anarchy spoils it: come and deliver us from this scourge!" After an existence of a thousand years, after having exhausted all the modes of despotism, Russia is once more on the verge of an abyss; and we say to the Emperor Alexander, "Sire, our country is vast "and fertile, but absolutism and venality spoil it: deliver us from "these scourges: grant us a government founded upon law, and "suitable to the needs of the time!"' (*La Vérité sur la Russie*, p. 378.)

Wherever compulsory labour (the *corvée*) exists, the most prudent way, says Prince Dolgoroukow, would be to yield the land to those who now cultivate it, in the portions which they at present hold. Where the serfs work under the *obrok* system, the proportion of land to be assigned to them must be otherwise determined: but the peasants must have land as property, when all rights of the proprietors over them are at an end, and all tribute, in kind or in money, ceases to be paid by the serfs.

For this land, each male serf should pay five roubles (16*s.*) a year for thirty-three years, unless he chooses to discharge the debt sooner. This payment would make him absolute proprietor of that much land. The owners should receive from the state 100 roubles (16*l.*) for each male serf; the wives, daughters, and widows being freed gratuitously. In order to accomplish this, the government might excuse the nobles the payment of their debts towards the credit-establishments of the state: it might contract a loan: or it might issue land-bills to the amount of about 61,000,000*l.*, receivable by government at par. Government might also sell by auction, during five or six consecutive years, Crown property of various kinds to the amount of 56,000,000*l.*, on condition that the purchasers should pay in the notes just described. The Crown peasants should pay for thirty-three years what they are paying now; and then be the real owners of their land. The pretended electoral rights of the Crown peasants should be made real: the special administration for that class should be abolished; and all members of every class should be equal before the law, and in the communes. In the towns, all the inhabitants possessed of real property of a certain value should take part in the municipal elections. There should be District Assemblies once in three years, consisting of proprietors, without distinction of birth, of land of a certain extent or value in town or country; and of a certain number of deputies named by the communes. The local business of the district would be provided for in these assemblies, as the larger affairs of the province would be by the triennial Provincial Assembly, consisting of one third of the deputies, and all the voting proprietors of the District Assemblies, with the voting proprietors in the Municipal Assemblies of the towns in the province.

We need not go further. These latter proposals are intended to decentralise the administration of the empire, as the former are to introduce the labouring class into the transactions of an organised society. Their emancipation is a matter of urgent necessity: they cannot be freed till fundamental changes have been made in the system of government; and their restoration to the possession of themselves necessitates the creation of a system in which they shall have their place as citizens on some footing or other. The grave questions recur whether the Emperor has ever intended anything like this? whether he will ever agree to it? whether, if he were willing, he would ever be allowed to accomplish his purpose? Still there is time, and there is a way, if we may trust the writers whose counsel we

have been examining. If the amiable and well-intentioned Emperor should seize the time, and insist upon the way, he will be the greatest benefactor to his country, and might eclipse the glory of Peter the Great. We cannot, however, conceal our impression that Alexander II. has neither the character nor the means to bring about the great and beneficent results which he doubtless desires. He belongs rather to the sovereigns who shake the stability of thrones and institutions than to the rulers who consolidate them; and it is much to be feared that the mighty work of emancipation in which he is engaged will not be accomplished without a social and political crisis which will convulse the Russian Empire, and may prove fatal to himself.*

* Amongst the recent literary productions which illustrate this subject, none is more able and instructive than 'Etudes sur l'Avenir 'de la Russie,' by D. R. Schédo-Ferroti, the *nom de guerre* of a writer residing at Moscow, but publishing at Berlin. We regret that we did not obtain a copy of these essays in time to avail ourselves of them more copiously. But they corroborate the opinions we have already expressed in the foregoing pages. One of the most hopeful signs in the present state of Russia is the great ability displayed by many writers on these important subjects, since the Russian press has been released from the excessive thraldom of the last reign; and whatever may be the incapacity of the government, men are certainly not wanting to guide the future destinies of that great empire.

ART. IX.- 1. *Briefe von Alexander von Humboldt an Varnhagen von Ense, aus den Jahren* 1827 *bis* 1858. *Nebst Auszügen aus Varnhagens Tagebüchern und Briefen von Varnhagen und andern an Humboldt.* Fünfte Auflage, Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus: 1860.

2. *Letters of Alexander von Humboldt, written between the years* 1827 *and* 1858, *to Varnhagen von Ense. Together with Extracts from Varnhagen's Diaries, and Letters from Varnhagen and others to Humboldt.* Authorized translation from the German, with Explanatory Notes, and a full Index of Names. London: 1860.

SHORTLY after the publication of the first series of the Duke of Wellington's despatches, an advertisement appeared in a morning paper offering for sale, at a solicitor's office in Lincoln's Inn, two letters from his Grace, the one written the very night of the battle of Waterloo, the other the day after. Colonel Gurwood was commissioned to purchase them; which he did, for the moderate price of 60*l.* The Duke, on their being placed in his hands, quietly put on his spectacles, read them through from beginning to end, and then thrust them between the bars of the grate, with the remark: 'I was a d—d fool when I wrote 'those letters.'

How heartily would Humboldt, and not a few of his distinguished correspondents, have echoed this exclamation could they have anticipated the publication with which Miss Ludmilla Assing has favoured the carping, sneering, gossip-loving public of Berlin. How ardently they would wish that they had at least acted on Dr. Johnson's maxim, when he said: 'It is now 'become so much the fashion to publish letters, that, in order to 'avoid it, I put as little into mine as I can.' 'Do what you 'will, sir,' replied Boswell, 'you cannot avoid it.' Certainly no man or woman of note has the smallest chance of escape, if we once admit the principle that everything for which a bookseller will pay, may be published by the representative of the individual to whom their letters were addressed. In this country the point is too clear for argument. The consent of the writer is indispensable, and the courts of equity will interfere to prevent a meditated breach of confidence. To give two instances amongst many, the publication of a volume of Sir Walter Scott's letters was prohibited at the instance of his executors, and the publication of the late Lord Dudley's delightful letters to Bishop Coplestone was for a time sus-

pended. Be the municipal or positive law what it may, the moral obligation remains the same all the world over. Humboldt could not transfer a privilege which he never possessed, and not the shadow of an excuse can consequently be alleged for printing the contents of an album or autograph book, into which most of the leading notabilities of both hemispheres had been stuck or pinned, with no more power of dissent or assent on their parts than if they had been so many butterflies in a glass case. In a letter (Sept. 9. 1844) to an English lady begging her for autographs, Varnhagen complains of the practice, 'most 'frequent in England,' of mutilating letters from motives of discretion; and to induce its discontinuance in his own case, adds: 'My collection will be bequeathed entire to those who 'come after me, as an historic-literary monument of our and the 'immediately preceding period, so that here any misuse is the 'least to be feared.*

This disposes at once of so much of the laboured apology, prefixed to the third edition, as rests on some loose expressions of Humboldt's in delivering over the letters of the late Princess Lieven, Arago, and the Grand Duke of Saxe Weimar into the custody of his friend. The portion of the apology referring to his own letters is confidently based on an extract from one of them (dated Dec. 7. 1841), which we have studied in every possible light without being able to discern the permission or authority which Miss Assing declares it to constitute or comprise. It is the motto of her compilation, and runs thus:--

'"Your last letter, so honourable for me, contained words which I should not like to misunderstand. 'You scarcely permit to yourself 'the possession of my impieties (*Impietaten*).' After my speedy decease you may deal as you please with such property. We truly owe truth in this life to such persons as we deeply esteem, therefore it is due to you."'

In glaring contrast to this, at least to the gloss put upon it, stands a written protest of Humboldt, brought to light by the controversy, in which, after saying that more than two thousand letters from his hand were annually thrown into circulation, he adds:—'I contest the supposed right of property of those to whom 'private letters have come accidentally or by purchase:' and so far as in him lies, he prohibits 'the printing of letters which he 'himself has not intended for the press.' This the lady editor represents as quite reconcilable with her theory, that he did intend

* Briefe an eine Freundin aus den Jahren 1844 bis 1853; von Varnhagen von Ense. Hamburg: 1860, p. 3. These, again, were obviously never intended for publication.

some of his letters for the press; that he reserved the right of authorising their publication in special cases like the present; and that her uncle, being fully empowered to deal as he thought fit with his illustrious friend's 'impieties,' she, the niece, was in duty bound to print every scrap of his writing, without regard to the feelings of the living or the reputation of the dead.

'In fulfilling so sacred a duty it became an act of piety to let every word remain exactly as it was written down. To have presumed to alter his expressions would indeed have been to offer an insult to the shade of Humboldt!

'Therefore, I have necessarily paid no greater heed to the well-meant desire of my publishers to make even the slightest alterations, than I did to my own personal wishes and inclinations. One thing only was here to be considered — eternal truth — truth which I owe to Humboldt, to history, to literature, and to the revered memory of him who has bequeathed to me this task. Behold then the bequest, unaltered and entire as it has been deposited in my hands!' (*Preface*, pp. ix, x.)

It has become, then, the height of piety to publish 'impieties,' by which Varnhagen, when he intimated his scruples in retaining possession of them, obviously meant the bitter personalities and irreverent comments which abound in the letters. Not one of these was to be suppressed or softened down. Every mischievous innuendo, like the allusion to the Princess Lieven as 'Madame de Quitzow,' with every perverse misrepresentation, like that which the Grand Duke of Weimar has certified under his hand to be 'a lie,' are essential parts of the eternal truth which is due to history, to literature, and to the honoured shade of Humboldt!

In the original, if not in the translation, the concluding sentence of the all-important extract resembles one of those Delphic prophecies, the interpretation of which might be varied or reversed by a change in the punctuation or the emphasis. *Wahrheit ist man im Leben nur denen schuldig, die man tief achtet, also Ihnen.* All depends on the stress to be laid on the *im Leben* and the *nur*. Miss Assing determines and expounds the meaning thus:—

'It may be asked, why did Humboldt specially wish for the publication of the letters sent to my uncle?

'A plain and distinct answer to this question is given in the letter of December 1841, in which spontaneously granting to my uncle the *wholly unsolicited* permission to publish the letters after his death, he says: "We only owe truth in this life to such persons as we "deeply esteem, therefore it is due to you." The logical counterpart of which is: In *death* we owe it to *all*, and first and foremost to our own nation.' (P. xvii.)

That we only owe truth in this life to such persons as we deeply esteem, would be a startling doctrine to emanate from a philosophic or well-regulated mind, unless for 'truth' we are to read 'the whole truth,' without which, indeed, the attempted inference or corollary falls to the ground at once. But if Humboldt thought that, after death, the whole truth was owing to all, why did he make any exceptions whatever? Why were any of his two thousand annual letters to be withheld? It strikes us that what he meant to say was neither more nor less than this:—'The possession of my letters disquiets you, on account 'of sundry passages which may occasion scandal or give offence. 'But why should you be uneasy on that account, since after my 'death you will have the entire control of them, to suppress or 'publish as you like. We are only bound to be perfectly 'frank and open with those whom we highly esteem. We 'are not bound to take the whole world into our confidence.'

The extracts from the Diaries are even more likely to make mischief and cause pain than the letters; yet those, too, are printed to fulfil a sacred obligation:

'As to the Diaries of my uncle, they too are not to be considered as the jottings of mere idle moments. He repeatedly exacted from me the positive promise to publish them. Discussing this subject, shall I ever forget in what animated and impassioned speech he inveighed with crushing argument against those who indulged a mistaken tender regard for an individual at the expense of duty to the people and to historical truth! Foreseeing very clearly the objections which have now been raised against the publication, he described most accurately and pointedly their mental and intellectual sources.

'This is all I have to say. For myself the question is settled by the fact that I have only executed the behests of both the great departed.' (P. xviii.)

We have seen already that Varnhagen was under a distinct pledge as to autographs; and in reference to his wife's diary, printed for private circulation, he had said, 'I have not knowingly selected a page which could be injurious to the living.'* Yet this is the man whose authority is evoked to sanction so gross a breach of the ordinary decencies of literature as may be read at p. 259. of the original, or p. 203. of the translation. There are expressions both in the letters and the extracts from the Diaries which (age and sex apart) would justify extreme measures of repression or retaliation. If we are to believe (what we hold to be incredible) that Varnhagen and Humboldt meant

* Rahel; Ein Buch des Andenken für Ihre Freunde. Als Handschrift. Berlin: 1833, p. 3.

these for posthumous publication, they would come very nearly within the range of Dr. Johnson's rough remark on Bolingbroke's literary bequest to Mallett: — 'Sir, he was a scoundrel 'and a coward — a scoundrel, for charging a blunderbuss 'against religion and morality; a coward, because he had not 'the resolution to fire it off himself, but left half a crown to a 'beggarly Scotchman to draw the trigger after his death.'

The editor's grand mistake, if she is acting in good faith, consists in her regarding the right of property in letters and diaries as involving the right and duty of printing the whole of them. The publishers of the translation, who term her justification 'perfect', must be suffering from a corresponding amount of logical, if not moral, obliquity, when, to justify the reproduction of libels on living persons, they ask:—

'And with due deference to the established rules of literary propriety, it might after all be asked which is the more desirable — to be attacked while living and able to defend oneself, or to incur posthumous obloquy, which our surviving friends may or may not feel disposed to ward off from our memory?'

When the chickens were asked with what sauce they would prefer being eaten, they replied that they would rather not be eaten at all. Did it never occur to these worthy publishers, that there are persons who would wish to decline both of the alternatives thus obligingly suggested? The public are seldom eager to look a gift, or even stolen, horse in the mouth. We take the goods the booksellers provide us, without stopping to ask, or caring to know, how they came by them. Nay, we are sometimes disposed to quarrel with over-scrupulous trustees and executors, who, as in the case of the Byron autobiography, insist on the destruction of a literary treasure. 'To do a great 'right, do a little wrong,' is a maxim with which we might be tempted to comply upon occasions, although we should be puzzled to uphold it against Pascal. But when the right or probable gain is little, and the wrong great, the transgressor is universally and unequivocally condemned. Far be it from us to undervalue this book as a contribution to the history of science, literature, criticism, or society in Berlin, but its claims in this respect would have been very little, if at all, lessened by the omission of the most objectionable passages, and the proposition which we especially dispute is that the name and memory of Humboldt will derive fresh lustre from it as it stands. We knew already that he was endowed with many of the highest gifts of genius, that his energy was inexhaustible, his knowledge vast and varied, his intellect of the most comprehensive order, his imagination rich, his fancy versatile and lively, and

his perceptions singularly quick. But we did not know, whatever we might suspect, that he had become envious and carping, wanting in charity and candour, faithless even to the royal friend with whom he sate at meat, a backbiter and a flatterer. In short, his bad qualities are now brought out in bold relief, to the (we hope) temporary obscuration of the good. He suffers, as Voltaire suffered from the discovery that he had quarrelled with Frederic the Great about loafs of sugar and candle-ends, or as Pope will suffer from the recent revelation of the fact, that his sustained spite against Lady Mary Wortley Montague was first kindled by her sending back *unwashed* the sheets which he had lent her when they were neighbours at Twickenham; an incident which might have suggested to both of them, in more senses than one, the prudence of washing dirty linen at home.

A distinguished member of the Manchester School is wont to maintain that, after a certain age, men of eminence should be prohibited from propounding opinions in public, because their authority increases as their judgment and mental vigour decline.* This would be rather hard on some of our octogenarian chancellors, or ex-chancellors, who exhibit no symptoms of decay; but the application of the rule to Humboldt would have been in every point of view a kindness and a boon. His ingrained propensity to satire had been kept under in early and middle life by the constantly shifting scenes of a stirring career, by lofty aims, by successful enterprises, by admitted triumphs, by growing and at length world-wide fame. It was unlucky that his later years were passed in an atmosphere peculiarly fitted to foster his defects. In Varnhagen's Diary for December 3rd, 1841, Humboldt is reported to have ended a note with these words:—'How murky and oppressive is the atmosphere in this 'the evening of my life' (*Es ist für mich eine trübe, schwere Abendluft*)! Upon this Varnhagen remarks:—

'Hard to be Humboldt, and yet obliged to speak thus, on the pinnacle of honour and in the fulness of fame. There is in truth little that can be a source of pleasure to him, and nothing but his satirical vivacity makes life at this place in any degree tolerable to him.'

Surely if there was much to regret, there was little to pity, in his position and state of mind. He had only to act upon his own emphatic warning, in a letter to Rahel, February, 1838: 'Guard 'carefully, *both of you*, your better nature (*Schonen Sie Beide 'Ihr besseres Sein*'). If he had chosen the cheering and ele-

* 'La renommée, fruit d'une longue patience de vivre, augmente avec l'imbécillité.' (*Humboldt to Varnhagen*, Nov. 20. 1856.)

vating, instead of the meddling and depreciating tone, he would have been a wiser, a better, and a happier man. The bane and antidote were both before him; and it was more his fault than his misfortune if he persevered to the last in saying illnatured things, or found himself at eighty almost in the condition of the hero (or heroine) of the well-known anecdote, who, by way of a new pleasure, was recommended to try the experiment of doing a little good.

The Upas-like influence of Berlin is the common excuse made for him. 'Humboldt,' observed one who disliked him to Varnhagen, 'was a great man till he came to Berlin, there 'he became an ordinary one.' This recalls a remark of Rahel's:—'In Berlin nothing retains its place; everything 'declines and becomes shabby: aye, if the Pope himself were to 'come to Berlin he would not long remain the Pope: he would 'become something ordinary, perhaps a riding-master (*bereiter*).' Yet the more confined air of Weimar had no such influence on Goethe, who erred in the opposite extreme, and was prone rather to idealise mediocrity than to depress superiority. For our parts, we no more believe in the irresistible force of circumstances in narrowing the mind or souring the temper, than in the possible conversion of Mr. Darwin's aquatic bear into a whale; although if an elderly gentleman goes about, like the bear in question, for hours together with his mouth open, catching flies, he may become in due course a determined *gobemouche*.

It would seem, too, that Berlin itself is not quite past praying for, and that a man like Humboldt might have fought a good fight against the evil genius to which he succumbed without a blow. 'This peculiarity of Berlin,' adds Varnhagen, after confirming his wife's remark, 'deserves, however, deeper investiga-'tion. It indicates a lively power of undeveloped greatness, 'and may, if developed into something Positive, carry Berlin 'on to its highest fame; but if it stops short in the mere 'Negative, it will of course become her shame! "Yonder," 'as Goethe somewhere observes, "live an irreverent race of "men." The idea is somewhat similar.'

The subject was one on which Varnhagen and his wife were admirably fitted to speak, for Rahel's *salon* was the most remarkable of which the Prussian capital could boast at any period; so remarkable, indeed, that several distinct publications have been devoted to her, besides stray notices in profusion.* She is the German Recamier; a very German

* See 'Rahel und ihre Zeit, von E. Schmidt Weissenfels. Leipzig, '1857.' Several notices by Custine, Brinkman, and others, are col-

Recâmier, indeed, will probably be the cry of any Parisian *coquette* or *petitmaître* whose feelings may be jarred like Coleridge's, when he heard Klopstock called the German Milton. But if Rahel had not the beauty and grace of her French rival, if she could not boast with equal truth of having had most of the celebrated men of Europe for adorers and kept them as friends, she had more heart and more mind, and she has left a more marked, a more durable, and we think on the whole a more enviable, impression of her individuality. She was of a Jewish family, and her maiden name was Levin. At the time of Varnhagen's first meeting with her she was the observed of all observers, as the heroine of a romantic passion, which, according to the current story, surpassed in intensity, exaltation, and unhappiness all that poets had sung.

'She appeared, a light graceful figure, small but well-formed, her foot and hand surprisingly small; the brow, with its rich braids of dark hair, announced intellectual superiority; the quick and yet firm dark glances caused a doubt whether they betrayed or took in most; a suffering expression lent a winning softness to the well-defined features. She moved about in her dark dress almost like a shadow, but with a free and sure step. What, however, overcame me most, was her ringing, sweet, and soul-reaching voice, and the most wonderful mode of speaking that I had ever met.' (*Rahel, Ein Andenken, &c.*, p. 5.)

This was in 1803. A German diplomatist, who passed an evening at her mother's in 1801, says that Frederic Schlegel, Gentz, Prince Radzivill, and Prince Louis Ferdinand of Prussia (the brother of Madame de Recamier's admirer) were amongst the guests. Baron Brinkman gives an amusing account of her introduction to Madame de Stäel, whose final impressions were enthusiastic: 'Elle est étonnante. Vous êtes bien heureux de 'posséder ici une amie pareille. *Vous me communiquerez ce qu'elle 'dira de moi.*' She was not married to Varnhagen till September 1814, when she was about forty-four and he thirty. A *soirée* in their house in 1829, described by a member of the diplomatic body, may be taken as a fair sample of their society, and will help us to judge whether the correspondence and the extracts from the Diary do justice to Humboldt in his happier mood. Besides Humboldt and the host and hostess, there were present Prince Pückler Muskau, General Cordova, Bettina von Arnim, and Professor Gans, the chief of the anti-historic school of jurisprudence. There was something sharp and ironical in Varnhagen that repelled the diplomatist.

lected in the eighth (posthumous) volume of Varnhagen's 'Denk-'würdigkeiten,' published in 1859. See also his 'Gallerie von Bild-'nissen aus Rahel's Umgang.' Two volumes, Leipzig, 1836.

'Humboldt,' he continues, 'who possesses the gift of clothing the deepest earnestness in a pleasing garb, and bringing it forward one while as apt anecdote, one while as scientific knowledge, one while as enlivening wit, was inexhaustible in communications of the most multiform kind, by dint of which the subject was reflected in an ever new light. The different species of piety which he had observed in all spheres of his comprehensive knowledge of the world,—amongst the Anglicans, Quakers, and Methodists: in Paris, under Napoleon's concordat, and at the court of Charles the Tenth: amongst Spanish Catholics, and amongst savages on the Oronoko and the Mississippi,—he classified them all, as a botanist his plants, according to fixed characteristic signs, and was anxious to examine those of the Berlin hypocrisy more nearly, to fix genus and species more confidently. But in the end he appeared to regard all kinds as artificial and corrupted varieties of one simple plant, which, in its genuine original state, is only to be found in lonely still places.' (*Denkwürdigkeiten*, vol. viii. p. 622.)

Rahel died in 1833, and Humboldt's letter of condolence is one of those that do honour to his heart. Her death was a misfortune both to him and his friend, for her influence was uniformly of the elevating and softening sort; and when she was gone, they both fell more and more into the desponding and depreciating vein. It required a woman's delicacy of perception and tact to harmonise the circle she had formed; where men bred in courts and camps, deeply imbued with the pride of birth and rank, were brought to mingle with authors and professors stiff from the library or the lecture-room; and we can easily conceive how two or three of these (personally well known in England) fell under the lash of the coterie when their natural protectress was no more. Varnhagen had been a diplomatist and a soldier, and Humboldt a minister plenipotentiary. Both were nobly born, and from habits and education were irresistibly led to side with the scorners. Conspicuous amongst these stood Prince Pückler Muskau, whose printed travels had the disagreeable and unforeseen effect of restricting his Highness's favourable reception to countries, like the East, where female honour is not easily assailable through books.* Another was an old Prince von Wittgenstein, who had an ample share of the peculiarities justly or unjustly laid to the charge of the late Mr. Rogers. Whenever a disagreeable thing was to be said or suggested, he was pretty sure to hit upon it. It was he who took upon himself what he no doubt found the agreeable task

* His 'Briefe eines Verstorbenen' are best known in England in the admirable version of Mrs. Austin, under the title of 'Letters of a German Prince,' in which many passages are suppressed or rendered harmless by the omission of names.

of hinting to Goethe that he had better not risk a visit to Berlin, lest his reception should not correspond with his merits and expectations.* Political and religious differences were not wanting to embitter the rivalries or enmities of caste; and when we call to mind that, even in this bustling and overgrown metropolis, statesmen and philosophers cannot always be prevented from levelling damaging sarcasms or still more damaging innuendos at one another, we cease to wonder that hard measure was dealt out to Radowitz, Bunsen, Eichhorn, Savigny, or Raumer in a capital, where the genius of the place breathes bitterness as naturally as an Alpine breeze braces the nerves or the air of Paris inspires gaiety.

The provocation was not all on one side. It was diamond cut diamond in Berlin. On the 30th April, 1841, Varnhagen sets down in his Diary that Humboldt has many enemies amongst the men of letters as well as at the Court, and that unceasing attempts are made to run him down. They were in the habit of alluding to him as the Archpriest of Chimborazo. He was painfully conscious of this hostility. In a letter, April, 1837, he declines to read a portion of his 'Cosmos' before more than ten or twelve persons, because Berlin is 'a little, unliterary, and 'over-spiteful town.' The King stood gallantly by his illustrious friend:—

'The King had been already informed that the book [the Kosmos] was antichristian and revolutionary. So far from that being the case†, however, the King writes to me, that "he could only say, like "Alfonso to Tasso, 'And so at length I hold it in my hands, and call "'it' in a certain sense my own.'"‡ This is poetical, and very courteous.'

The footing on which he stood with the King is incidentally elicited by (probably no unfrequent occurrence) a misreport of what had passed at the royal table:—

'As I always sit opposite the King, I converse aloud only with him, but very freely, because I know that people will repeat my sayings, fashioning them each according to his own style of colouring, in a country where, besides, many a hint of delicate censure is lost, owing to the utter want of settled conversational language.'

* 'Was schiert mich der Berliner Bann?
Geschmäckler—Pfaffenwesen!
Und wer mich nicht verstehen kann,
Der lerne besser lesen.' (*Goethe.*)

† The original is *dagegen*, 'on the other hand.'

‡ 'So halt' ich's endlich denn in meinen Händen,
Und nenn' es in gewissem Sinne mein.'
(*Goethe's* '*Tasso*,' Act. i. Sc. 3.)

Their intimacy appears from such notes as this:—

'Cherissime Humboldt, vous connaissez tous les prétendants à toutes les couronnes—lisez, de grâce, la lettre ci-jointe et faites-moi connaître le *seigneur Cados*, ses père et mère et aïeux, ainsi que ses droits à la couronne de France, que je tâcherai alors à lui procurer.

'Frederic Guillaume.

'B. 21 févr. 1839.' 'Pr. royal.

On December 26th, 1845, Varnhagen records:—

'Humboldt paid me a visit, and remained more than an hour. He made a remarkable communication to me. He assures me that but for his connexion with the Court he should not be able to live here. So much was he hated by the Ultras and the Pietists that he would be exiled. The pains they took daily to prejudice the King against him were incredible; and he would be as little tolerated in other German States were he once to be deprived of the protection afforded him by the *prestige* of his office.'

He could hold his own against the strongest of his assailants, and occasionally made them repent of their aggressiveness:—

'General Leopold von Gerlach, who cannot leave off teasing, lately ventured to make an attack on Humboldt by saying to him, "I suppose your Excellency often goes to church now?" He hoped thereby to put him in a dilemma. But Humboldt answered at once, "That *now* of yours is very kindly put in: you mean to point out to me how to make my way in the world." The canting jester was regularly dumbfounded!'

To understand the full force of another of his repartees, it must be remembered that the Russian faction were constantly struggling for supremacy in the councils of Prussia:—

'At the royal table of Sans Souci the conversation turned on a Russian ordinance, and Humboldt in speaking of it mentioned the name of the Minister of Public Instruction several times. "You are "mistaken," interrupted the King; "this was not the work of the "Minister of Instruction, but of the Minister of Enlightenment. "That's quite another person from the Minister of Instruction." Humboldt, without being put out, accepted the correction by hastily adding, "Not the Minister of Instruction then, but of the contrary;" and then continued in his usual way.'

The deliberate judgment of so critical an observer as Humboldt on an historical personage who has been so much discussed as Frederic William the Fourth, would carry the greatest weight if we could get at it apart from partialities and antipathies; and though such influences are only too apparent in most of his recorded opinions, we can still, by the collation of passages, arrive at a tolerable approximation towards the truth. A journey to Paris had the effect of making him, if possible, less

indulgent towards things or people in Berlin. On his return from a mission to the King of the French in March, 1843, he visits Varnhagen, who writes thus:—

'Humboldt came to see me to-day; he has aged much since I saw him last; but his mind and heart are both fresh and vigorous. He was cheerful and happy whilst in Paris, but here at once a melancholy mood has come over him. What he found here was wretchedness; the old well-known way of trifling with dangerous things in childish hilarity. Besides, he is overwhelmed with complaints and demands. Every one wishes him to speak—to use his influence. "Influence," he exclaims, "nobody possesses! not even Bunsen and Radowitz, the "King's favourites; they can do nothing but humour the fancies and "foibles they detect, serve and sacrifice to them, and if they were to "want anything which lay beyond that sphere, it would soon be all "over with them. The King does just what he likes, and what "results from his early fixed opinions; and if perchance he listens "to advice, it has no weight with him." He speaks with contempt of Eichhorn and Savigny, as hypocritical sycophants, who allow themselves to be led by Thiele, Gerlach, and Hengstenberg. The King has given up none of his former plans, and he may any moment make new attempts with them in reference to the Jews, the keeping of Sunday, the consecration of bishops in the Anglican fashion, the new arrangements regarding the nobility, &c. He forms plans as if he were to live to become a hundred years old; he thinks of erecting immense buildings, of laying out parks and gardens, of carrying out great works of art, and also of travels. A visit to Athens has already been mooted, and in the background there no doubt looms a pilgrimage to Jerusalem! Napoleonic expeditions of peace to London, St. Petersburg, and to the Orient, and conquests of scholars and artists instead of countries! Art and fancy on the throne, fanatical jugglery round about, and hypocritical abuse in sport! and with all that, a man truly intellectual, truly amiable, and animated with the best will! What will all this come to!'

The same views are expressed a few days afterwards (April 1st) when occasion is taken to have another slap at Bunsen:—

'The King, he says, is occupied with nothing but his fancies, and these are mostly spiritual and religious, rituals, church-buildings, missions, and the like. About earthly matters he takes little care, and whether Louis Philippe's death brings about a crisis, what may happen at that of Metternich, or what our relations are with Russia, are matters of perfect indifference, nay, he hardly gives them a thought. Whoever is favourite for the time and manages to indulge his fancies, has the game in his own hands. Bunsen, Radowitz, and Canitz stand highest with him; Stolberg, only in the second rank. With all that, there is the greatest absence of mind and thoughtlessness.

'Bunsen has not grown wiser. He proposed to the King to buy California, to send missionaries there, &c. He energetically favours

the enterprises of Baroness Helfert. He wished to send out his own son with her, and offered to supply from his private means 12,000*l.* sterling towards establishing colonies where the missions should form the principal element. However, he withdrew his offer, seeing that he could not rely on the sympathies of the King. . . .

'Humboldt thinks him vain enough to accept a place in the Cabinet. It seems to me that Humboldt has by far too much intercourse with Bunsen, and shows him too much friendship.'

The diarist hazards the concluding remark in apparent unconsciousness of the serious imputation that may be based upon it. Humboldt's outward bearing too friendly towards the man of whom he never writes or speaks (behind his back) without a sneer! Baron Bunsen's private worth and public services, profound learning, zeal to promote religion, and genuine philanthropy, are so well known in this country, that no misrepresentation of his character or conduct can do him harm; or we should not feel justified in giving additional publicity to these repeated displays of unprovoked bitterness. We are far from concurring in many of his peculiar views, especially on ecclesiastical matters, and we can readily believe that his eagerness to forward them may have made him an unsafe counsellor for a King who was unduly prone to be led astray by sentiment or imagination. But, if he erred, he erred in perfect good faith and honesty of purpose; and his influence, commonly exercised from a distance, was of too intellectual and refined an order to be confounded with the arts by which royal favour is ordinarily won and kept.

General Radowitz, again, was not less admired for the extent and variety of his attainments and accomplishments than esteemed for the unswerving rectitude of his conduct. His introduction to the Prussian Court was exclusively owing to the sacrifices he had incurred in the cause of truth and honour for a daughter of Prussia. He threw up all his appointments in 1848, rather than lend the smallest sanction to a line of action which he disapproved, and when he was recalled in April, 1849, it was to become the organ of constitutionalism. The effect of his speech in developing the new scheme of government and policy in the Second Chamber on the 25th August, is described as electrical. 'At the conclusion,' writes a distinguished adversary, 'the applause knew no bounds; the enthusiasm was such 'as the Hungarians felt when Maria Theresa presented herself to 'them. The Right and the Left, the Centre and the First Chamber, applauded together. The galleries clapped lustily; it was 'only in the diplomatic ranks that we observed hands which

'knew well how to applaud Fanny Cerito, abstain from giving 'any sign of applause. *Chacun a son goût.*'

A man capable of acting such a part on such a stage, is not the wood of which weak-minded, vain, flattery-loving, or pleasure-seeking princes make courtiers; and so long as his faculties remained unimpaired, Frederic William the Fourth was not a sovereign of whose companionship the most fastidious stickler for independence of thought, or freedom of speech, in confidential intimacy could feel ashamed. Like Joseph the Second of Austria, or Louis of Bavaria, or our own Charles the Second, the unhappy King of Prussia was endowed with qualities which, though misplaced, useless, or even dangerous upon a throne, would have given an irresistible charm to his companionship, had his destiny been cast in a private station. He had not the iron will, the comprehensive foresight, the knowledge of men, the unity or steadfastness of purpose, the grasping ambition, the insensibility to suffering, and the intense selfishness, without which talents and hereditary power combined are rarely converted into instruments of greatness. But he had taste, fancy, generosity, sensibility, tenderness, and wit. He could enjoy a Greek play, or weep over a modern melodrame. He could appreciate every description of artistic excellence, whether exhibited in an opera by Spontini, a picture by Cornelius, a poem of Goethe's, or a statue of Rauch's. He could draw plans and landscapes, and write verses. He had read and talked, if not thought, a good deal about forms of government, but his notions about them were too loose and fanciful for practical application in serious times, and when the crisis of 1848 arrived, he might have soliloquised like Hamlet:—

> 'The time is out of joint; oh! cursed spite!
> That ever I was born to set it right.'

'On his coming to the throne,' writes a clever but satirical observer*, 'he looked about for what had given him most 'pleasure during youth in verse or prose, and upon one and the 'same car of triumph arrived, to take up their winter-quarters 'in Berlin, the poet Tieck with his unstrung lyre, the painter 'Cornelius with his disarranged pallet, the philosopher Schelling 'with a confused philosophy, the poet Rückert with an hypo-'chondriac poesy.' At a masked ball, got up with artistic skill under the direction of Cornelius, the King is described lounging through the rooms, in a black domino, with his glass to his eye, bowing gracefully on either hand till he catches sight of M.

* 'Erinnerungsblätter von A. von Sternberg,' Leipzig: 1857. Zweiter Theil. p. 86.

von Sternberg. 'The King remained standing and addressed 'to me some friendly words about my book (a novel). These 'words were really friendly, and the so-called friendly words of 'princes are not always so. Neither before nor since have I 'known or found a man with such a winning expression in 'gesture and word as this prince has at his command.' . . . 'It is unnecessary to say anything of his personal appearance: 'it is not attractive, if attractiveness is placed in the elegance 'and beauty of form and feature; but it is attractive in the 'highest degree, if the benevolent, friendly, animated expression 'is taken into the account.'

In an able article on Berlin and its society in the 'Revue 'des Deux Mondes,' M. Blaze de Bury confirms this account: —

'Let us beware of forgetting the intellectual expression amongst the characteristic signs of this royal physiognomy. He should have been seen after dinner, with his cup of coffee in his hand, going from one to another, and talking of everything with a spirit, a piquancy, a felicity of *mots* for which the editors of the "Kladderadatsch" (the German "Punch") would assuredly have much envied him. Rarely on these occasions did old Tieck strike in; he listened, whispering with his neighbour, but his malicious smile seemed to say: "I also, "I have wit; and so much, so much, that I have made it very difficult "for others to have any."'

Tieck had his revenge on the evenings fixed for his celebrated readings, which also formed the grand attraction of his own evening parties at Dresden. The king, seated at a table, amused himself with sketching or tracing architectural designs with a pencil; the ladies had their knitting and embroidery as a resource; the male part of the audience got through the treat or infliction as well as they could, not unfrequently yawning, and sometimes indulging in a nap.

We could almost find it in our hearts to regret that the calm current of so pleasurable an existence should have been ruffled by the duties and cares of sovereignty. They eventually proved too much for him; he sank into a profound melancholy, which rendered him unequal to the administration of affairs, and the kingly office devolved on his brother, the present Regent; who undertook it with unfeigned reluctance, and has uniformly declared that, if his suffering relative's vigour in action had equalled his sagacity in council, neither Prussia nor Europe would have had reason to complain. His vacillation produced the worst consequences in the autumn of 1853, when Radowitz, who might have animated him to a more decisive course, was dying. On the 9th of August, 1855, Humboldt writes: —

'The Prince, whom I take to be a lover of truth, assured me that,

faithful to his principles, he had spoken out everywhere to the purport, that war would probably have been avoided if Prussia and Austria from the very beginning had earnestly and actively co-operated with the Western Powers against Russia. At Petersburg they had objected that the Emperor Nicholas would not have yielded, even in this case, which he, the Prince, doubted.'

Varnhagen's report throws the entire blame on Prussia:—

'Speaking of the Prince of Prussia, Humboldt said the Prince had said at St. Petersburg, just as he had previously done here, that the war would have been avoided if Prussia, at the very outset, had assumed a resolute attitude; the Emperor Nicholas would then have yielded.

'Speaking of the position of Prussia, Humboldt said it reminded him of a pleading which he had once heard in Paris; the counsel for the prosecution, in the matter of a box on the ear, had wound up, triumphantly exclaiming: "*Au fond nous n'avons pas reçu le "soufflet, nous n'avons eu que le geste!*"'

Humboldt is at some pains to refute an imputation of republicanism, founded on his saying that he was as liberal as Arago. If he was as liberal as Arago, and was wont moreover to take a cosmopolitan rather than an orthodox view of religion, we need go no farther to account for his mode of speaking of the Prussian statesmen who belonged to the Conservative and pietistic school. Nothing can be happier than his manner of pointing and feathering his shafts:—

'You have praised my endeavours—the object of my highest ambition—to avoid fossilization, so long as I am permitted, to be active, and to hold fast the belief that "Nature has laid her curse "upon stagnation." Youth is the emblem of Progress, and the ruling powers here (the Berlin world-elephants) *sont des momies en service extraordinaire*. Good night.'

'When Parry, on the ice, wanted to reach the Pole with his numerous Samojede dogs, sledges and dogs apparently went *forward*. When, however, the sun broke through the mist, and the latitude could be ascertained, it was found that, without being aware of it, they had actually gone several degrees *backwards*. The ground over which they moved *forward* was a detached field of ice carried south by the current. Ministers are this moving icy ground. Is the current the dogmatising Missionary Philosophy?'

It could not be objected to Humboldt that, in criticising practical politicians, he was speaking theoretically; for he had tried his hand, and shown that his genius could efficiently adapt itself to their ordinary work:—

'Read to-day (writes Varnhagen, November 21st, 1841) Alexander von Humboldt's Despatches, written from Paris in 1835, to the King. Not the least like what comes from Alexander Humboldt! They might

have been written by anybody, and, worst of all, no one could have written them otherwise than they are! Such is the nature of political affairs. They resolve themselves into trifles of no intrinsic importance, but made weighty from a general understanding that they shall be so regarded. Add to this the stereotyped hypocrisy of forms, assumptions, and exaggerations, and truth must ever be in danger of being lost. And I examined myself, and confessed that were I once engaged in the like matters, I, too, should be unable to raise myself out of this groove! And then, people wonder that in England and France journalists become ministers! As though very ordinary despatches were not infinitely easier to write than first-rate leading articles!'

It is true that, during the ten years included in M. Louis Blanc's celebrated history, journalism was a frequent stepping-stone to power or place in France. It is also undeniable that politicians of all grades occasionally contribute to newspapers in England. But there is not a single instance to our knowledge of an English newspaper writer becoming a minister by his articles; although it is not the less true that it is far easier to write the despatches that figure in our blue books, than the best leading articles of the 'Times.'

The *odium theologicum*, which has passed into a proverb, must be a myth if such a comparison as the following could be forgiven: —

'He (Humboldt) had, in a box, a live chameleon, which he showed me, and of which he said "that it was the only animal which could "direct one of its eyes upwards, while looking downwards with the "other; only our parsons were as clever, directing one eye to heaven, "and the other to the good things and advantages of the world."

'I am pestered (he said) in my old age as if by midge stings (*mückenstichen*), and, to crown all, I have the honour of being consulted from time to time by an extra-super-Christian, Mr. Forster (resident at Brussels), as to whether I believe the souls of the lower order of animals come within the scope of *redemption* — whether, in fact, bugs and midges are to be partakers of heavenly bliss. If they are, I am threatened with them hereafter, and therefore shall find those well-known "animal spirits" with which I have made such close acquaintance on the Orinoco, hymning their songs of praise.'

From Nebraska he had been requested to pronounce his opinion on the 'whereabouts' of the swallows in winter. Varnhagen asked him if this was not an open question. 'Yes,' he replied, 'I know as little about it as anybody; but I have not 'written that to the people at Nebraska, because we ought never 'to confess such a thing.'

It is difficult to believe such an instance of sanctified prejudice as this: —

'The vilest fellow of the whole concern is Privy Councillor N——, a mean sneak and hypocrite, full of hatred and venom. "The Garcia "cannot sing here," he said some time ago, "she is too 'red' for "that;" every representation that her singing would not be red, being in vain, I, at last, said to him, "Well, then, send to Bethania*, "and let the deaconesses sing." He will be happy to see me underground.'

Privy-Councillor N—— was not alone in this charitable wish: —

'It was said, on the presence of Humboldt, the day before yesterday (25th September, 1853), at the sitting of the Ecclesiastical Board, that the parsons had had among them their worst enemy, the Naturalist, who had put them all to shame, and before whom all their humbug and deceit vanished. "Abellino (a famous bandit) "among you," one might have called out to them.'

Kingcraft fares no better than priestcraft in his hands: —

'And then the cheering sight of four Crown Princes and Heirs Apparent: the one a pale sciatic creature, the next a besotted Icelander, the third a blind political fanatic, and the fourth obstinate, opinionated, and feeble-witted. Such is the future monarchical world!'

The date is June, 1842; and the translator states, in a note, that the four meant were the Crown Prince of Wirtemberg and the heirs apparent (now kings) of Denmark, Hanover, and Bavaria.

In January, 1842, the King of Prussia came to England to attend the christening of the Prince of Wales.* Humboldt accompanied him, though strongly disapproving the expedition, as originating with Bunsen, and as likely to lead to 'an intimate union with the Anglican Church and the Tories—downright ruin.' On his return (February 24th, 1842,) he called on Varnhagen:—

'Humboldt has given me a very favourable account of England. At court, great splendour, but a simple and natural mode of private life; conversation easy and friendly, and good-natured in its tone, even between the members of rival political factions. Peel he does

* House of Protestant Sisters of Mercy in Berlin.—Tr.

† The following lines, forming part of the description of the assemblage at the ceremony, by Leigh Hunt, are said by the editor of his 'Poetical Works' to allude to the King of Prussia and A. von Humboldt: —

'And princes, and the genial king,
With the wise companioning;
And the mild manhood, by whose side
Walks daily forth his two years' bride.'

not like, did not like him before, says that he looks like a Dutchman, is rather vain than ambitious, has narrow views. Lord Aberdeen's taciturnity is invincible. It has not, however, the effect of making folks believe he could if he would say something good. Bunsen has, in numerous instances, shown an utter want of tact: all the world is against him. The King more than ever disposed to take his part. Even Englishmen say, "The whole affair of the King's journey is "only an intrigue of Bunsen's."'

Humboldt's treatment of the Prince Consort were alone sufficient to prove the inaccuracy and perversity of his impressions, and the tenacity of his prejudices, when his self-love had been wounded. Instead of thanking him immediately for the first volume of the 'Kosmos,' the Prince waits till he has read it, and then (February 7th, 1847) writes a very flattering letter, which ends thus:—

'May Heaven, of whose "revolving Seas of Light and Terraces of "Stars" you have given us so noble a description, preserve you for many years to the Fatherland, the world, and to "Kosmos" itself, in unimpaired freshness of body and mind. This is the sincere wish of

'Yours very sincerely,

'ALBERT.'

A copy of 'Catterwood's Views in Central America' accompanied the letter. Humboldt thus comments on the epistle and the gift:—

'As to Prince Albert I had, at his request, when he was at Stolzenfels, ordered a copy of my "Kosmos" to be laid in his apartment, and he had the politeness not to thank me for it. Now the Black Bird* has made him polite, at least partly that, and partly — —. He makes me speak of "revolving Seas of Light and *Terraces* of "Stars;" a Coburg reading of my text, *quite English*, from Windsor, where all is full of terraces. In "Kosmos" there occurs once the expression *Star-carpet*, to explain the starless spots by *openings* in the firmament. The book on Mexican Monuments, which he *makes me a present of*, I bought two years ago. A fine illustrated edition of Lord Byron's works would have been a more delicate compliment. It is strange, too, that he never mentions Queen Victoria; who, perhaps, does not find my book on Nature sufficiently Christian. You see, I judge severely when princes write.'

A week later he writes:—

'You were right in scolding me for my too great severity against the Man of the Star-Terraces. I am severe only with the mighty ones, and this man made an uncomfortable impression on me at Stolzenfels. "I know that you sympathise greatly with the misfortunes "of the Russian Poles. Unfortunately, the Poles are as little de-"serving of our sympathy *as the Irish*," *mihi dixit!* And we are the handsome husband of the Queen of Great Britain!'

* The Prussian Order of the Black Eagle.

It is difficult to conceive anything more ungracious or unjust. That the remark on the Russian Poles and the Irish was ever made in sober seriousness by His Royal Highness, is in the highest degree improbable. He was not bound to know that Humboldt already possessed Catterwood's work, or would have preferred a handsome edition of Byron; and if we were to choose between star-terraces and star-carpets, we should say that star-terraces is the less prosaic metaphor of the two.

The Grand Duke of Weimar adopted a decisive and summary mode of parrying a still more mischievous attack contained in an extract from the Diary:—

'Once after a gentleman not belonging to the nobility (*Bürgerlicher*) had left the company, he (the Grand Duke) expressed with great satisfaction the comfortable feeling, "Now we are amongst "ourselves." Another time, when it was noticed that there were thirteen at the dinner-table, he replied consolingly, that "there were "two commoners (*Bürgerlicher*) amongst them, who did not count "for anything!" And this he told Humboldt in French, because, as he said, "these two would not understand that."'

The Grand Duke wrote on the margin opposite the last passage, '*This is a lie.*—Karl Alexander,' and then deposited the book in the library at Weimar.

Humboldt has been equally unlucky in the attempt to turn the Duke of Coburg-Gotha into ridicule, for aspiring to the title of King of Eastphalia. We are assured that this was a project of Chevalier Bunsen's, and was never regarded by the Duke or the King of Prussia in any other light than as a subject of jocularity.

It may be some consolation to the Prince Consort to find that no amount of deference, and no height of celebrity, are sufficient to protect Humboldt's correspondents from his malice, if there is an ambiguous or infelicitous phrase to fasten upon. He is not quite content with Manzoni's most elaborate epistle, and when Metternich compliments him, on his eightieth birthday, with having made a noble use of his *fortune morale*, he drily remarks, 'The phrase "votre fortune morale" is very 'freely applied.' Madame de Lieven fares nearly as badly as the Prince Consort:—

'Madame de Quitzow, who has never written to me for the last twenty-five years, wants to know from me, whether the Emperor Paul, during the epoch of his political insanity, had caused the proposal to be made by Kotzebue, that instead of the armies, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs should engage in single combat. I was at that time (1799 and 1800), traversing the Delta of South America, and had no knowledge whatever of the anecdote which the Russian

princess (who, as it now appears to me, has a very strong leaning towards Western ideas and predilections), wishes to have authenticated. According to rather untrustworthy accounts which I have gathered, the proposal was, that the Monarchs themselves, not the Ministers, should enter the lists for the duel.'

No one would suppose that he had, by assiduous court, invited a communication. Her letter to him begins:—

'Vous ne m'avez pas oubliée, mon cher baron. Je le sais par deux messages bienveillants que le baron Brockhausen m'a portés de votre part. Je l'ai bien chargé de vous en témoigner ma vive reconnaissance, mais je trouve mieux encore de vous la dire moi-même. Aujourd'hui je la fais servir de passeport à une question que je me permets de vous adresser.'

Then comes the inquiry; Paul's proposal, as she states it, being that the belligerent Powers, great and small, should submit their quarrel to trial by battle in the persons of their ministers, Pitt, Thugut, &c.: whether they were to form two parties, or fight a quadrilateral or quinquelateral duel, does not appear. As Francis the First challenged Charles the Fifth, and Frederic William of Prussia and George the Second had arranged the preliminaries of a meeting, the notion of a combat between monarchs was too commonplace to have fastened on the imagination of the Czar.

The sentence passed by Humboldt and Varnhagen on Lord Normanby loses force by exaggerated severity and coarseness of expression. On the 8th March, 1858, Varnhagen writes:—

'Humboldt sends me, with some friendly lines, the book of the Marquis of Normanby on the Revolution of 1848. He calls it an indiscreet and almost silly book. I call it a stupid, and, as far as its contents are concerned, a treacherous one; it shows how injurious it is to have anything to do with diplomatists, especially with an unofficial one, as the Marquis then was, to whom both Lamartine, as well as Cavaignac, have lent too ready an ear. He is one of the dullest and most tedious Englishmen that ever existed.'

On the 9th of March, 1858:—

'Read farther in Normanby. He is a poor simpleton, but, by means of his ill-written (*schlechten*) book, one learns how to understand sufficiently the contemptibility of Louis Philippe, the baseness of Guizot — the destructive influences of sneaks and rogues. Moreover, he is a master in the art of toning down all that is most animated and buoyant in these mighty events to mortal tediousness.'

Lord Normanby's book was not of a nature to do much mischief to those whose characters he attacked, but so far as his own reputation was concerned, it had better have been suppressed.

We can only venture to copy a part of the remarks on French personages and politics in January, 1852:—

'About one o'clock Humboldt called. He is wonderfully active for his years! He is indignant at the *coup d'état* in France, the exercise of brute force, the arbitrary banishments, but especially at the confiscation of the Orleans property. The King at first was in high glee. He, as well as the Court, thought little of the crime committed against the people and their representatives; against justice, and in violation of a solemn oath. But that the Adventurer allows Universal Suffrage to remain; that he leans upon the people and practises Socialism, and, above all, that he aspires to an Imperial crown, this it is which makes them hate him!'

It is worthy of remark, that the bulk of the higher classes in England did not become alive to the full extent of the outrage against law, justice, and morality perpetrated by the *coup d'état*, until the confiscation of the Orleans property, a foolish as well as wicked measure, yet certainly not equalling in atrocity the bloodshed, the perjury, and the rest of the wholesale robbery involved in the usurpation. On the 5th February, 1852, Humboldt writes:—

'It has ever been my opinion, that even the wildest Republic can never do as great and lasting injury to the intellectual progress of mankind, and to its consciousness of its inherent titles of honour, as *le régime de mon oncle, le despotisme éclairé, dogmatique, mielleux*, which avails itself of all the contrivances of civilisation to make the will and caprice of one man paramount.'

The *régime de mon oncle*, besides its present degrading and demoralising influence, is laying the train for an incalculable amount of future misery. If it lasts many years longer, the French will have unlearnt all they had painfully learnt of parliamentary or representative government, and their return to free institutions will be the signal for a new succession of disorders, ending probably in a fresh resort to despotism.

It is one of the redeeming points about Humboldt, that he is invariably clearsighted and uncompromising when liberty is at stake, and is fired with just anger whenever a tale of oppression is repeated to him. Thus, when Mr. Brooks received honours instead of punishment for his dastardly attack on Mr. Summer, Humboldt writes:—

'Thus the infamous party, which sells negro children of fifty pounds' weight, and gives away canes of honour (as the Russian Emperor does swords of honour, and as Grüfe (a surgeon) makes noses of honour), proving that all white labourers had also better be slaves than freemen,—has triumphed. What a monstrosity!'

In a literary and scientific point of view, the letters in which

Humboldt consults Varnhagen about the 'Kosmos,' are the most valuable in the collection. Varnhagen combined a mastery of language, and a felicity of style, with a precision of thought and a refinement of judgment, which are rarely found united. He was regarded by his illustrious friend, who mistrusted himself in the mechanical parts of authorship, as an oracle for form and expression; 'You alone are my literary counsellor, you in whom depth of feeling is blended with so wonderfully harmonious talent of expression.' He transmits his proof-sheets, with the request to have noted on a separate leaf what is to be altered, and particularly what is to be substituted, and on receiving them back, he exclaims, 'A thousand thanks. I have adopted all — followed every hint.' The title of the 'Kosmos' was long and anxiously disputed, and the entire plan will be found developed and explained in the letters.

Indisputably the most interesting of the letters reprinted from the Autograph Book, are Prince Metternich's. In one of them (May 10, 1846) he makes a strange avowal: —

'J'ai dans l'age où la vie prend une direction, éprouvé un penchant, que je me permettrais de qualifier d'irrésistible, pour les sciences exactes et naturelles, et un dégoût que j'appellerais absolu pour la vie d'affaires proprement dites, si je n'avais vaincu mon dégoût irrésisté à mon penchant. C'est le sort qui dispose des hommes, et leurs qualités comme leurs défauts décident de leurs carrières. Le sort m'a éloigné de ce que j'aurais voulu, et il m'a engagé dans la voie que je n'ai point choisie.'

On the subject of another letter, Varnhagen remarks in his Diary of the 2nd of April, 1840: —

'A long autograph letter from Prince Metternich turned up at home. He declares my picture of the Vienna Congress to be perfectly true, with some slight exceptions that could be easily set right. He himself circumstantially confirms the relation of the arrival in Vienna of the news of Napoleon having left Elba — a letter of historical value!'

This helps to complicate what was already an historical puzzle and a very curious case of conflicting evidence. The statement confirmed by Metternich is that the first intelligence of Napoleon's departure from Elba was received by the Prince at six in the morning of the 7th March, in a despatch from the Austrian Consul at Genoa, which, not guessing its importance, he did not open till near eight. Before nine he had personally communicated it to his Imperial master, the Emperor of Russia, and the King of Prussia. He then requested the attendance of the ministers plenipotentiary, who were ignorant of what had happened till he told them. This is Varnhagen's version. M.

Villemain's ('Souvenirs Contemporains') is, that the news arrived by a message from Sardinia to the Court of Austria on the evening of the 5th March, during the representation of some *tableaux vivans* at the palace. Sir Walter Scott ('Life of 'Napoleon') says that the announcement was made to the Congress by Talleyrand on the 11th of March, and that laughter was the first emotion that it excited from almost every one.

If we may put faith in 'Recollections by Rogers' (p. 208.) the Duke of Wellington told him that he (the Duke) received the first intelligence from Lord Burghersh, then minister at Florence; that, the instant it came, he communicated it to every member of the Congress, and that 'they all laughed, the Em-'peror of Russia most of all.' Now an eminent judge, who still adorns the Bench, asked the Duke at Strathfieldsaye whether he remembered the laugh, and he has favoured us with the following note of the reply:—

'"Laugh! No; we didn't laugh. We said, 'where will he go?' And Talleyrand said, 'I can't say where he will go; but I'll under-'take to say where he'll not go, and that is to France.' Next day, when we met, the news had come that he had gone to France, and we laughed at Talleyrand. That's the only laugh I recollect." Then he turned to another subject.'

It were a waste of time to try to reconcile these statements, but an impressive warning against undue confidence, in even the most trustworthy reminiscences, may be drawn from them.

Varnhagen died in October, 1858; Humboldt not till May 6th, 1859. The last letter in the collection is one from him to Miss Assing, condoling with her on their joint bereavement. He calls her his dear, beloved, intellectual friend; and there can be no doubt that she enjoyed the full confidence and esteem of both the eminent men who are so closely bound together in her book. This, in our opinion, aggravates her guilt in bringing them before the public in this fashion; and it is to be hoped that the merited censure she has incurred by her indiscretion will have some effect in preventing future offences of the sort. One of the principal sufferers from Humboldt's caustic pen and tongue, predicates that worse is yet to come; and if no more scandal or malice should be produced from autograph books or diaries to which he intentionally or unintentionally contributed, the failure of the supply will certainly not arise from the poverty or exhaustion of the mine.

ART. X.—*Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire.* Par M. A. THIERS. Vol. XVII. Paris: 1860.

IN this volume M. Thiers' history descends to the peace of 1814, and chiefly concerns the territorial limits which were then imposed on France. If the author had published a pamphlet 'Sur les Frontières Naturelles,' he could not have more directly excited the French people to accept the late annexation of Savoy as a mere instalment of their due, than he has done on the present occasion. The chief tendency of this volume, and we presume, therefore, its aim, is to dissatisfy Frenchmen of 1860 with boundaries of empire which two generations of Frenchmen had been content to maintain. Every foreign statesman who offered compromises to Napoleon during the invasion of France in 1814 is here indiscriminately praised for wisdom and moderation, and every foreign statesman who stood by the frontiers of 1790 is denounced as a demon of war. It may be well, therefore, to show that nothing was subtracted from France even in 1815, which she had not previously abstracted from some other State since 1790.

But before we discuss this special characteristic of the seventeenth volume, we shall glance at the fuller view which we can now take of the principles of the author, and of the character of the whole work. We have already offered our testimony, which M. Thiers does not require, to his power of depicting historic scenes, and of portraying individual character*, though his merit in this respect is seriously diminished by his utter inability to seize or comprehend any subject except from the narrow side of national and personal predilection. His chapters on the Russian war of 1812 are masterpieces of description; his chapters on the German war of 1813 comprise the most vivid of all the portraits of Napoleon; his chapter on the Concordat vindicates his claim to philosophise on government; his strange travesty of the defeats of France by England on sea and land attests the ingenuity with which he can make fiction plausible. His descriptive power is equal to that of Macaulay or Voltaire; those of his chapters which treat of politics as a science are as lucid, and almost as amusing, as those in which he narrates the course of events; but his treatment of all things foreign to France is not more faithful than that of the Roman historians and memoir-writers to the Carthaginians; and his political economy is, if possible, even worse than that of Sir Archibald Alison.

* See Ed. Rev. vol. cvii. p. 358., and vol. cviii. p. 32., for reviews of the preceding volumes of M. Thiers' History.

But the salient moral characteristic which must be acknowledged to pervade almost every volume of this work, is the negation of the great principle of DUTY and right, and the recognition in its place of an abstract entity which we shall term Bonapartism. What the First Napoleon happened to do, commonly stands forth in M. Thiers' history as the supreme index of what ought to be done. In this crucible nearly every principle of right and wrong is dissolved. It is true that while M. Thiers anxiously disguises the very least of the blunders which may do his hero intellectual discredit, he rarely conceals or affects to distort those actions which we hold to be moral crimes. But this apparent inconsistency accords with what we take to be the axiom of his Napoleonic religion. Worse than M. Fouché, who callously distinguished between crimes and blunders in favour of the former, M. Thiers appears to acknowledge no crime but a blunder. We will not go so far as to say that conformity to the actions of Napoleon is his sole test of morality; but he certainly does himself the last injustice if he regard actions as good or bad according to any higher standard than the fact of their being performed by Napoleon. Preceding writers who have criticised either his politics or his strategy are rebuked without number and without mercy; but no aspersion is thrown on Napoleon for a judicial murder, a glaring falsehood, or an unprovoked war. It is not, therefore, for any want of disposition to critical rigour that M. Thiers fails to condemn actions which other civilised and Christian men would denounce as immoral. The only exceptions to this rule occur where, as in the campaign of 1814, either the political pretensions or the military strategy of Napoleon led directly to his fall. The explanation of this exception, in the system recognised by M. Thiers, probably is that the Emperor was co-existent only with the empire, and that any act on the part of the former which tended to destroy the latter implied the suicide of his own omnipotence. There is certainly no dishonour which M. Thiers does not palliate, there is no crime which he does not at least tacitly defend, there is no injustice in which he does not glory, if only committed by Napoleon, unless 'malheureusement,' as he tells us, it led to the fall of the Empire.

These are harsh words, but they will be borne out by all who care or choose to distinguish between the signal ability of this work and its inhuman spirit. We do not use them with any prejudice against a *régime*, the glories of which we freely recognise. We have, however, a distinct right to expect that the historian of that period in the next age shall not dress up its triumphs and its crimes together in indiscriminate panegyric.

It is one thing for a ruler to be led away by the passions of a violent age and of active life; it is quite another thing for a writer persistently to vindicate those passions through fifteen years of historical meditation. If we were to take up this work as a fair instance of the tone of thought prevailing in the nineteenth age, we should be forced utterly to disbelieve in the possible growth of moral principles in political life. Tacitus and Livy wrote at periods in which, for want of a purer revelation, war was impersonated at the head of the national religion; M. Thiers, some eighteen centuries after them, seems to inculcate nearly the same belief; and he defends actions from which they would have recoiled. He is, in truth, to the First Napoleon very much what the disembodied spirit of the Greek was to its own former existence:—

> 'Where ev'n the spirit, as the form, a ghost,
> Dreams back life's conflicts on the shadowy coast;
> Hears b[illegible] the clashing steel, the armed train,
> And lifts the airy spear, and murders hosts again.'

In this general view of M. Thiers' work, we cheerfully offer one reservation. An isolated passage in the new volume offers a view of the misery inflicted on France by the wars of the first Empire; and it is due to the author to record it as the only protest against those wars, which this volume, and perhaps the whole history, contains:—

'France, disgusted with liberty by ten years of revolution, was now disgusted with despotism by fifteen years of military government, and of bloodshed from one extremity of Europe to another. The violence of the prefects in seizing the youth of the people by conscription, that of the higher classes by the formation of guards of honour; terrifying with tax-gatherers' bailiffs families whose sons made no answer to the call; end[illegible]ing flying columns against the refractory, which traversed the country, often treating French provinces like conquered provinces; turning into compulsory taxes pretended voluntary gifts proposed and acquiesced in by their own adherents; seizing at once provisions, horses, cattle, in the shape of requisitions; a suspicious police taking up the slightest words, arbitrarily imprisoning those who were charged with holding them, and always feigning to be present, even though it was not; the greatest misery at the ports, resulting from the absolute closing of the sea; upon land-frontiers but lately opened to our industry thousands of foreign bayonets not allowing one bale of merchandise to pass; in fine, an unspeakable and universal fear of invasion, all arising from the will of one unchecked authority, were a harsh lesson which had annulled that which had been drawn from the ills of the Revolution, and which, without rendering France republican, led her to desire a monarchy freely constituted.' (Pp. 39, 40.)

This lucid interval of judgment is preceded and followed

by a delirium of war; but no candid critic can fail to reproduce it, though it is quite powerless to cancel the general tendency of the work.

With this exception, the present volume is marked by two leading characteristics. On the one hand the author pursues his former task of painting the military achievements of the empire in the most brilliant colours, as he traces the desperate struggle of Napoleon against the fourfold invasion of 1814; and the volume concludes with a general review, extending over eighty pages, of the great period that he has before described. In this all its triumphs are again detailed, as it were, a miniature taken from a colossus; but from this picture the popular miseries it produced are studiously eliminated. On the other hand, the volume is distinguished from its predecessors by tracing the various negotiations for a permanent settlement, which intervened between the overthrow of the French rule in Germany in November 1813, and the fall of the Empire. This latter portion, apposite as it is to the politics of our own day, shall here claim our chief attention.

It appears to be M. Thiers' cardinal object to show that the claim of France to what he terms her 'natural frontiers' is indefeasible. At the same time, he tells us that he is not a Bonapartist, and that he would be affronted if he were accused of being a supporter of the imperial government. It is true that he has not directly avowed himself an advocate of the existing empire; and it is also true that he may support the national pretensions to these exorbitant boundaries without affection for a Bonapartist *régime;* for the ministers of Charles X. bequeathed to the public evidence of as ardent a desire for the acquisition of the line of the Rhine as any that the great Napoleon carried into effect. But M. Thiers' denial of Bonapartism is refuted on every page; his ambition for territory mingles with his enthusiasm for war, and for other exclusive attributes of the first empire. Let his dynastic preferences, however, be what they may, this volume can only have been written for the purpose of rousing the ambitious and vindictive sentiments which we had hoped that the French had permanently thrown aside. Let us see, then, on what basis this elaborate effort of the author to dissatisfy his countrymen with the frontiers established in 1814 and 1815 actually reposes.

The French people, we know, are among the most jealous and sensitive of the world, in all that concerns national honour and national territory. It may be from some sentiment of wounded pride as well as from sheer ambition, that the opposition of a certain party to the limits of 1814 and 1815 arises.

Few Frenchmen can endure to be beaten back out of former acquisitions. But however respectable this sentiment may be, it is obviously one which holds, not only against the loss of what are termed 'natural frontiers,' but against every retrocession of the French rule. It would be as applicable to the terms of the Congress of Prague, which recognised the French Empire from the North Sea to the Gulf of Venice, as to the terms of the Congress of Châtillon, which described France more or less precisely within the boundaries of 1792. We shall endeavour to show that the French people can scarcely have more historic ground for claiming, as 'natural' adjuncts of their empire, the territory which was in dispute at Châtillon than the territory which was in dispute at Prague. Either claim on the part of France rested on the fact of recent conquest; while both would have been repudiated by prescription. The French people ought certainly to be careful how they make annexations in war, if they cannot endure to relinquish them in peace.

M. Thiers appears to rest the claims of France, in 1814, to the line of demarcation which follows the Alps and the Rhine, on the east and on the north, upon three principal grounds. In the first place he asserts this line to form the natural frontiers of the country:—in the second, he urges that the Allied Powers, having conceded such frontiers to Napoleon in the overture of peace made from Frankfort, in November, 1813, were not competent to disavow them in the later negotiations;—and in the third place, he holds that Russia, Austria, and Prussia should have made restitution of Poland—England of all the colonies she had taken during war—before they enforced the limits of 1792 upon France, and that France was entitled in 1814 to the line of the Alps and the Rhine, as a counterpoise to the Polish partitions. We must confess our surprise that so acute a writer should deliberately commit himself to three positions, which, with all our desire for the restoration of Poland, we hold to be equally indefensible.

In the first place, then, let us see what 'natural frontiers' really are, and how far the Alps and the Rhine would fall within such a designation? In order to vindicate such a title, the territory which these frontiers would comprise must be united by something more than mere geographical proximity, or the absence of such natural barriers as immense rivers or chains of mountains, neither of which commonly serve for the boundaries of states. It can be founded only on a more or less complete fulfilment of four conditions:—there must be geographical affinity, historical identity, social analogy, and

community of language. The Italian claim to the Alps as a natural frontier, for instance, may be founded in common reason; for it rests on at least three of these conditions; and it has some pretensions in tradition also, a great part of the Austrian acquisition being comparatively recent. But the French claim to the Rhine and the Alps as a natural frontier, is little more than an idea drawn from geography. Every one knows that before the wars of the French Revolution, the Low Countries, though subject, like Italy and Spain, to French incursions, were as independent of France as either Italy or Spain. Between the French northern frontier of 1790, and what M. Thiers chooses to term the French 'natural frontier,' which we take to be the Rhine, there intervenes a territory which had been the inheritance of the House of Austria for near three centuries, and had, before the Austrian acquisition, been equally independent of France and Austria. Indeed we must go back to the Carlovingian age to find France and Belgium under one crown; and Charlemagne's Empire did not recognise either the Rhine, the Alps, or even the Pyrenees for a frontier. So much for a claim founded in prescription.

Secondly, in regard to the existence of a claim founded in social sympathy between France and Belgium—such as no doubt prevails between Venetia and the rest of Italy—every one will acknowledge that the antipathy to France among the mass of the Belgian people is profound. Again; the vernacular tongue of the great part of Belgium,—a country which M. Thiers so bitterly assails the Allies for requiring France to disgorge, as though an indivisible portion of her territory—is quite unintelligible to a Frenchman; while his community of origin with the Flemings is slight and partial; and it would be difficult to describe the boundaries of the two languages much more precisely than by the historical frontier of France and Belgium. It is impossible, therefore, to attach any signification whatever to a term so vague, and so incapable of sustaining the slightest analysis, as the 'natural frontiers' of France. Spain might with at least equal reason claim Portugal on the ground that her natural frontiers are the sea and the Pyrenees: Russia might, with as much plausibility, claim throughout the line of the Vistula from Prussia, or the line of the Danube from Turkey. The Confederation at Frankfort might as well claim the very territory in dispute from the Rhine to the Sambre; and, again, the territory between the Rhine and the Elbe, on the ground that Dutch and Flemish are dialects of German.

In regard to M. Thiers' next position, that these frontiers

were conceded to France in the overtures of Frankfort, we need hardly observe that the terms which one belligerent can offer to another must bear some correspondence to the actual state of a campaign at the time at which they are propounded. Unless a definite period for which they are to stand good, is fixed by the belligerent which propounds them, they cannot be reclaimed by the other belligerent after fresh battles, when he finds that fortune has turned against him. M. Thiers himself acknowledges that the Frankfort basis offered in November, was not distinctly accepted by Napoleon until the latter conferences of Châtillon in March, when the Allied Powers, after a fierce campaign, had formally withdrawn it. He goes further; and freely confesses the dissimulation and bad faith with which Napoleon received the propositions of the Allies from Frankfort, with the view of carrying on war and negotiation simultaneously, and of repudiating the proffered terms if once more victorious on the Rhine. We shall see therefore as we proceed, that M. Thiers might as well claim of the negotiators at Châtillon and Paris the terms which Prince Metternich offered to Napoleon at Dresden, as the terms which he sent in the name of the Allies from Frankfort.

M. Thiers' last position is, that if France were to return to the frontiers of 1790, the balance of power required that commensurate restitution should be made by the other great Powers of the territory they had obtained since that period. We shall give M. Thiers' argument, which he offers in treating of the conferences of Châtillon, in his own words:—

'Ensuite, à considérer les choses du point de vue de l'équilibre Européen, comment, après avoir dit à la France en entrant sur son territoire qu'on ne voulait point lui contester la juste grandeur qui lui était acquise, comment la ramener aux frontières de Louis XV., lorsque depuis Louis XV. trois des puissances du continent s'étaient partagé la Pologne, lorsque depuis 1790 toutes les puissances avaient fait des acquisitions considérables qui changeaient complétement les anciennes proportions des Etats? Si pour le repos de l'Europe on devait généralement revenir aux limites de 1790, n'était-il pas juste que chacun restituât ce qu'il avait pris, que l'Autriche ne songeât point à retenir Venise, que la Prusse et l'Autriche ne gardassent pas ce qu'elles avaient dérobé aux petits Etats allemands et surtout aux princes ecclésiastiques, que la Prusse, l'Autriche et la Russie rendissent la dernière portion qu'elles s'étaient attribuée de la Pologne à l'époque du dernier partage? N'était-il pas juste enfin que l'Angleterre rendît les îles Ioniennes, Malte, le Cap, l'île de France, etc.?' (Pp. 292, 293.)

M. Thiers here confounds three distinct questions. He throws together, first, the partition of Poland between Russia,

Austria, and Prussia — secondly, the acquisition of Venice by Austria — thirdly, the possession of certain colonies by England. Each question stands on a separate basis. Taking first the question of Poland, there is no doubt that the 'former proportions' of the partitioning States underwent a change. But M. Thiers argues it as one of 'European equilibrium'; and no one will consider either Austria or Prussia too powerful to be consistent with the independence of France. Russia certainly was unduly augmented; but her preponderance in the East has weakened, not so much France, as Austria and Prussia, two of the three States which M. Thiers desires to reduce in power. A restoration of Poland was as firmly advocated by Lord Castlereagh at Vienna in 1814, as it can now be by the French historian. But victorious belligerents never yet acted towards each other precisely as they deal with a defeated enemy; and the Polish question, important as it was, had no direct reference to the struggle of Europe against French aggression.

The examples of Venetia obtained by Austria, and of certain colonies retained by England, are still more inapposite. The rule of Austria in Venetia may be quite as odious as the rule of the three partitioning Powers in Poland. But it was Bonaparte himself who surrendered the Republic of Venice to Austria by the Treaty of Campo-Formio, and the fact is, that the Italian provinces resumed by Austria in 1814 were scarcely more populous or important than the Belgian provinces which she had possessed in 1790, and for which the former constituted an equivalent. M. Thiers then turns upon England as a country which ought to have made restitution of all the insular dependencies that had accrued to it in war. He cites the Ionian Islands, Malta, the Cape, and Mauritius. This is again to assume that the victorious and the defeated belligerents were to stand on precisely the same terms. But M. Thiers says nothing of the territorial restitutions which this country did in fact make, and which were denounced at the time as little less than a capitulation. Independently of the vast possessions restored by England to other countries, such as Holland, which had been arrayed by France against us, we restored to France herself the Island of Bourbon, Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Guiana, and her Indian establishments. These possessions were in the absolute disposal of the British Government. They were, therefore, freely given up.

M. Thiers, however, not only misapprehends the positions assumed by the Allied Powers in 1814; he even misapprehends the position then assumed by his own country. He speaks everywhere of the territorial settlement of 1814, as

though it re-established the French frontiers of 1790; whereas that treaty assigned to France the wider limits which she possessed down to the 1st of January, 1792. By the peace of 1814, therefore, France actually obtained a great portion of the territory intervening between the frontier of 1790 and the Alps, which he assails the diplomatists who signed the first treaty of peace for entirely withholding from her! If France had adhered to that peace, the Allies would of course have respected the terms of it. But in the following year a military revolution took place in France; Bonaparte resumed the government; war broke out afresh; and the Allies, again successful, then re-established the formerly existing frontier of 1790. Here is a direct confusion of dates and misconception of facts in M. Thiers' history.

Let us therefore at once state what the arrangements of 1814 really were. These are to be deduced chiefly from three documents,—the treaty of Chaumont of the 1st of March, the convention indicating the preliminaries of peace with France signed on the 23rd of April, and the general treaty of the 30th of May. The acts of the Congress of Vienna concluded the general settlement, and the subsequent Treaty of Paris, of the 20th of November 1815, finally determined the French frontiers, as we have said, according to the basis of 1790. The arrangements of 1815 do not fall within the scope of M. Thiers' present volume. We are therefore chiefly concerned with the Treaty of Paris of the 30th May. It has been stated that the frontiers of the 1st of January 1792 were taken, in that treaty, as the general basis of an arrangement of the French dominion. Subject to this, several inconsiderable cessions were exchanged, some being made by France, others being made in her favour, the difference being an excess of 450,000 in population in favour of France over the limits of the 1st of January 1792. This was the dominion allotted to France in Europe. But beyond this England restored to France, as we have said, Bourbon, Martinique, Guadeloupe, and French Guiana; while France had nothing to restore but the European countries which had already been reconquered by force of arms. Nor was this all. France regained the rights connected with the fisheries on the coast of Newfoundland and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, which are the chief nursery of her seamen, and two-thirds of the fleet taken at Antwerp were conceded to her, the remaining third being transferred to Holland. The immense proportions to which the empire of Napoleon had suddenly attained, serve to blind M. Thiers to the truth that the spectacle of a country so conquered, and yet so preserved by its con-

querors in its ancient integrity, nowhere else presents itself in history.

We shall now take a rapid view of the successive negotiations as they are detailed by M. Thiers. We have said that he commences, in this volume, with the first overtures made by the Allies after the French army, defeated at Leipsic, had re-crossed the Rhine in November 1813. M. de St. Aignan, the French minister at Weimar, and brother-in-law of M. de Caulaincourt, having been taken prisoner during the advance of the allied armies, was employed by his captors as Lord Yarmouth, a French prisoner of war, had been employed by Napoleon seven years before. He was in November charged by the Allies with a pacific mission to Paris; and M. Thiers not only explains the terms of peace now offered to France with accuracy, but frankly acknowledges the sincerity of the Allies and the dissimulation of Napoleon.

He describes, at p. 31., the negotiation of Frankfort, on which so much of his argument depends, as arising out of assurances made by each of the allied ministers to M. de St. Aignan, from which he draws the following most important deductions: —

'It was at first M. de Metternich who took M. de St. Aignan aside, to offer him this sort of mission. He declared to him that Europe desired peace; that she wished it to be honourable and acceptable to all the world; that she knew that France, after twenty years of victories, had acquired the right of being respected, and that she should be so; that it was not contemplated to restore the former order of things in its entirety; that Austria especially did not intend to retake all that she had formerly possessed; that it would be sufficient to return to a proper and secure position; that there was the end of the aims of all the allied princes; that, in proof of this great wisdom among them, M. de Metternich was charged to propose to France her natural frontiers, that is to say, the Rhine, the Alps, the Pyrenees, but nothing beyond,' &c. (P. 31.)

In the next page we read that —

'M. de Metternich, in support of what he brought forward, introduced successively M. de Nesselrode and Lord Aberdeen, who repeated, in terms shorter but equally formal, all that he had said himself. Lord Aberdeen declared, in the name of his own cabinet, that it was not desired either to lower or humiliate France, that no one dreamed of disputing her natural frontiers, since it was known *qu'il y avait des événements sur lesquels il ne fallait pas revenir;* but he repeated that beyond these limits there was a resolution to accord to France neither territory nor positive authority, nor even influence, except that which great States always exert, each on the others, when they know how to avail themselves of the advantages of their position without abusing them.' (Pp. 32, 33.)

For the words thus ascribed to Prince Metternich and Lord Aberdeen, M. Thiers offers no authority; but we may accept them as generally conveying the views of the Allied Powers at the moment of the deliverance of Germany, though it is probable that they were used with somewhat more reserve. The precise preliminaries in which the Allies agreed are thus stated by the author:—

'France should retain the Rhine, the Alps, the Pyrenees, but should there terminate; Holland should be independent, and its frontiers on the side of France should be afterwards fixed; Italy should be equally free; and the limits which Austria should obtain there on the side of Frioul, and France on that of Piedmont, should be matter of discussion. Spain should regain her dynasty, this condition was *sine quâ non*. England should also make restitutions beyond sea, and each nation should enjoy such liberty of commerce as should be stipulated by the law of nations.' (Pp. 33, 34.)

M. Thiers correctly states these as the terms on which a majority of the Allies were ready to make peace before the invasion of France began. Italy was now subtracted from the terms offered at Prague so late as the month of August 1813, previous to the battles of Dresden and Leipsic. Austria had undertaken at that time to become a mediator in favour of a peace on the basis of the abolition of the Rhenish Confederation, of the Continental System, of the pretensions of the Bonapartes in Spain, and of the other acquisitions of France beyond the Rhine. The additional demands now made by the Allies consisted, therefore, merely of Italy, and of a more distinct renunciation of French influence in Germany.

The moderation of these terms arose partly from a general and sincere desire for the termination of hostilities, and partly from an apprehension as to the result of a campaign in the French territory. But M. Thiers himself does not dispute that the conclusion of peace on such a basis depended on the single will of Napoleon. It was proposed that a congress should meet at Manheim to arrange a peace upon these preliminaries, if agreed to by the French Government.

M. Thiers distinctly states that the Emperor Napoleon did not accept the terms which he has put into the mouths of Prince Metternich and Lord Aberdeen. He tells us (p. 36.) that Napoleon 'makes a prompt but ambiguous answer.' He himself characterises the answer of the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. de Bassano, as 'at once enigmatical and ironical' (p. 58.); and he adds, that on receipt of it M. de Metternich addressed to the French minister a complaint that 'he did not notice with 'the same pleasure (as the prospect of a congress) the care

'which the French Government took to avoid every kind of 'explanation on the heads of arrangement proposed at Frank-'fort' (p. 58.). M. Thiers adds that the Emperor was actuated in this equivocation by two motives,—first (p. 35.), that 'he 'feared to avow too clearly his distressing situation,'—a ground of dissimulation hardly to be censured,—but, secondly, that the conditions which he transmitted to the Allies after their expostulation, 'were founded on the hope of an adjournment of 'hostilities until the month of April' (pp. 61, 62.). In the previous volume the author showed us that the Emperor had never designed to make peace when he accepted and prolonged the Congress of Prague. He now shows that Napoleon no more designed peace in accepting a congress at Manheim. It follows that, although it was competent to the Allies to offer these terms anew at any future time, they were then entirely free from any positive engagements, and were perfectly justified in insisting on the limits of 1792, or even on those of 1790, at Châtillon.

The next or second phase of these negotiations presents the abandonment of the Frankfort basis by the Allies themselves. This happened in December. M. Thiers declares, with probable truth, that as soon as this basis became known to the chief agents of the Coalition, it produced 'une agitation extrême,' and 'une amère désapprobation.' But at p. 124. he takes care to ascribe this change in the counsels of the Allies to the intervention of the most sordid policy of England. 'England,' he writes, 'having entertained a hope of taking the Scheldt from us, 'demanded that France should return to the frontiers of 1790.' He asserts in the plainest terms that the withdrawal of the Frankfort basis was dictated solely by ourselves, since the interests of Russia, Austria, and the rest of Germany, had been already satisfied by that scheme, and England was resolved to wrest Antwerp and Flushing from France. Accordingly, he describes the instructions of Lord Aberdeen as suddenly changed. Having thus brought the views of Lord Aberdeen and Lord Castlereagh into direct opposition, he suddenly discovers the great merits of the former statesman, and describes him as 'un homme sage et prudent,' though he must be perfectly aware that the straightforward conduct of the British Plenipotentiaries, to each other and to the Allies, was the most powerful bond of union to the whole coalition, and that which most effectually promoted its ultimate success, by setting an example of disinterested attachment to the common cause.

Two remarks may here be made on this laboured attempt to throw on England the odium of exclusively circumscribing the

French frontiers. M. Thiers has confessed, at p. 116., that the Frankfort propositions, as soon as they become known, 'sont 'universellement repoussées' at all the Allied Courts. Why then ascribe to England alone a repudiation which has in effect been just before ascribed to the common sentiment of the Coalition? And if M. Thiers' method of rendering his assertion plausible,—namely, that Russia had been reassured at Warsaw, and Germany at Hamburg, Bremen, and Magdebourg, but that England, on the Frankfort basis, was still as much threatened by sea as before,—be really worth anything, it seems to evince an inequality in the terms, to the prejudice of the country which he describes as exclusively withdrawing them. Any one, however, who will refer to the 'Castlereagh Correspondence' of this period will perceive that, independently of the warlike spirit of the Prussian generals, the Emperor Alexander, while drawing his supplies from England, was so clearly at the head of what M. Thiers terms the 'guerre à l'outrance' party, and so resolved on a triumphal entry into Paris, that he was on more than one occasion checked by Castlereagh.

Napoleon, however, and the Allies were always widely at issue. In January 1814, M. de Caulaincourt was accredited to treat for peace; but his demands were, even then, much larger than the obsolete terms of Frankfort. They comprised (p. 194.) not only the grand line of the Rhine, but territorial rights for nearly the whole House of Bonaparte in Italy. The kingdom of Westphalia had previously been claimed for Jerome. It is clear, then, that there was no approximation, down to this period, in the terms of the belligerents.

Lord Castlereagh now reached the allied camp, and his presence marks a third period in this history. M. Thiers states with remarkable clearness the extraordinary position which he at once assumed, as the nearly absolute minister of a Court which controlled the supplies of war, and of a Power which had been not less victorious than the other Allies in the field. But, *more suo*, he paints the policy of the British minister as confined to a few propositions in the separate interest of his country. 'Lord Castlereagh,' he writes (p. 236.), 'presents 'himself with three clearly defined aims,—the constitution of 'the kingdom of the Netherlands, the marriage of the Princess 'Charlotte with the Prince of Orange, and silence on the 'questions of maritime law.' We think that it would have been more politic on the part of the British Government to have kept free of any arrangements tending by any possibility to unite the British and Dutch crowns; and that such an expedient as the Belgian neutrality, afterwards devised by Lord

Palmerston, would have secured England against future demonstrations from the Scheldt quite as effectually as any dynastic alliance. But while the Tories affected to consider that Castlereagh had settled the affairs of Europe, M. Thiers describes the active part of his mission as confined to the marriage of the Heiress-apparent, and the delimitation of the dominions of her intended husband! His assertion with regard to the maritime question is contradicted, with marked particularity, by a letter of Lord Castlereagh to Lord Bathurst, in which the former writes that 'the allied sovereigns adhere to the *de-* 'termination which they had previously declared, of not per- 'mitting that question to be mixed up with any negotiation that 'may take place.' (Castlereagh Correspondence, 30th January, 1814.) This evidence that the maritime question was already settled when Lord Castlereagh quitted England, scarcely confirms M. Thiers' view of the negative part of the mission he assigns him.

We now reach the Conferences of Châtillon, which began in the first days of February, and terminated on the 19th of March, within twelve days of the capitulation of Paris. M. Thiers thus characterises the attitude of the Allies: —

'The conditions which were to be offered, we may state after half a century, were *indecent.* Not only was it required of France to fall back within her limits of 1790 (though no other Power was willing to fall back within the limits of that date), but it was required that she should answer these propositions at once, and that she should answer by "Yes" or by "No." Moreover, it was pretended to interdict her from taking any part in the fate of the countries which she was about to cede. What was to be done with Poland, Saxony, Westphalia, Belgium, Italy, — how Bavaria, Wirtemberg, Switzerland, were to be treated, — nothing of all this need concern her.' (P. 242.)

This is M. Thiers' great point of attack against the Allies. Similar expressions perpetually recur. Thus, at p. 262., the French historian assumes 'the exclusion of his country from 'the future European arrangements;' at p. 291. he characterises the proposals of the Allies as 'unparalleled insolence;' and (at pp. 294, 295.) he essays the yet bolder invention, that, in the conferences of Châtillon, 'M. de Caulaincourt endeavoured 'to express some observations,' but that 'he was almost refused 'a hearing, and that it was signified to him that he must answer 'by "Yes" or "No" to the proposed conditions.'

We shall show that these alleged facts are totally misstated. Two principal assertions may be instanced. M. Thiers first represents the negotiation of Châtillon as though the French minister

were abruptly dismissed at his first interview, and all diplomatic courtesy forborne by the Allies. The fact is, that these conferences were eight in number, and continued for six weeks.

It happens, however, that Minutes of the Conferences of Châtillon have been preserved. They were originally taken by Sir Charles Stewart (the late Lord Londonderry), who was accredited on that occasion, and are published at the close of the 'Castlereagh Correspondence.' The earliest minutes relate to the second conference, and no more decisive refutation of M. Thiers can anywhere be adduced than from their testimony. After the demand of the Allies that France should re-enter upon her former limits had been put, the dialogue proceeds thus: —

'*Caulaincourt.* — It is evident that you have changed your intentions. I only desire to know in twenty-four hours what you wish: establish your decisions.

'*Stadion.* — The proposition is established on our part as far as possible at present.

'*Caulaincourt.*—We fall into discussion, and this I wish to avoid.' 'Tell me what you demand: you have but to prescribe: I will finish immediately.' (*Appendix to Castlereagh Correspondence.*)

The refusal of discussion is entirely on the side of the French minister. Six other conferences, each at an interval nearly of a week, followed this of the 7th of February. The despatches of M. de Caulaincourt perpetually miscarried, while those of the other diplomatists did not; each miscarriage became a pretext of fresh delay; and though the Allies, after the sixth conference, formally declared the negotiation broken by France, their deference to the high character of the French minister led them to hold two subsequent conferences, in excess of their instructions. So much for M. de Caulaincourt's alleged restriction to 'Yes' and 'No.' The other assertion, that France was to be excluded from the arrangements for the provinces of which she would be deprived, mistakes the basis of negotiation for the actual terms of peace. The Allies insisted simply on the preliminary settlement of the French frontier. They could hardly negotiate with France for the new government of any French province, until France was prepared to cede such a province.

Meanwhile, M. Thiers, with astonishing inconsistency, clearly shows that Napoleon was insincere throughout his pacific protestations; and that no peace could be made with him until he was deprived of his last regiment. From the Frankfort negotiation of November until after the capitulation of Paris itself, his diplomacy is conceded by the author to have been exerted

simply to facilitate the strategic movements on which he still relied for ultimate success and which he never suspended. Within a few days of his quitting Fontainebleau for Elba, and while he was in negotiation with Alexander, M. Thiers depicts him as preparing for a general attack on the positions of the Allies with the 70,000 troops that he computes yet to have remained to him, and a battle (in the words which the author ascribes to the disaffected members of his army) 'given in the heart of Paris, apparently with the view of killing 'as many Parisians as Austrians, Prussians, or Russians.' The conception of this plan, its communication to the marshals of Fontainebleau, its reception by the rest of the army, and its final miscarriage, are as graphic as any of M. Thiers' descriptions. It will surprise no one that Napoleon should have played a desperate stake for the recovery of his lost crown. But the hideous project of a massacre in Paris, and of the probable destruction of the capital, scarcely extorts even a feeble and reluctant censure from the historian, who declares that 'it were 'better for France to perish than to abandon her natural fron-'tiers.'

In the terms thus forced at length upon France, M. Thiers affects a paradoxical comparison with those which Napoleon had extorted from the enemies he had himself subdued:—

'Certainly Napoleon had abused victory; but in the midst of the intoxicating smoke of Rivoli, of Austerlitz, of Jena, of Friedland, he had never thus treated the conquered, though they were not only conquered but crushed.' (P. 242.)

Nearly the same statement reappears in p. 296. The author forgets that Napoleon in 1807 halved the dominions of the King of Prussia, and levied a war contribution of 26,000,000*l.* upon them, after hostilities of but a few months' duration. The Allies, no doubt, in 1814 and 1815, deprived France of a considerable territory and a large indemnity in money. But both the one and the other were but the restitution of exactions previously wrung by France from most of her continental antagonists.

What then were in reality the guiding motives and leading objects of the territorial settlement of 1814, which M. Thiers so singularly disfigures? The first among these was unquestionably that of maintaining France in such a degree of power as to secure her equality with the most powerful States, but at the same time to secure their independence against her pretensions and aggressions. What we have already stated in regard to the relative population of several of the great Powers, under

the settlements of 1814 and 1815, goes far to bear out this position. France had been great and respected within the limits of 1792 and 1790; and intervening events had not affected her capacity to be great and respected still when those limits were reimposed; while, on the other hand, it had been shown that the settlements of Tilsit, of Presburg, and even of Luneville, were incompatible with the independence of other nations.

The equilibrium of Europe thus dictating such frontiers as were now actually drawn out, the next question related to the new government of the territories taken from France. These were of two classes. Populations, in the first place, of about 16,000,000 were severed from the French Empire, and populations again, of some 16,000,000 more, were freed from subordination as its external dependencies. In order to render the territorial boundaries of France also the limits to her political authority, it was designed that the *Etats limitrophes* should be powerful enough to resist her. Four principal changes were effected with this view. Holland and Belgium were united in a single monarchy on the north; Genoa was annexed to Sardinia on the south-east; the independence of Switzerland was protected by a general guarantee; and Germany was united into one Confederation. These being the main objects of the Allies, the principles on which they chiefly acted may be thus defined. They generally accepted all territorial rights dating prior to the Revolution, and prescriptive claims, wherever they were not incompatible with the aim of establishing a cordon of States, powerful enough, in future times, to maintain their independence against France, but not so powerful as to give to France any grounds of apprehension or insecurity. The France of Napoleon was that of a vast empire, encroaching upon Europe by means of external dependencies; the France of the Restoration was a moderate empire, restrained within its limits by the interests afforded to surrounding States in the strict maintenance of those limits. During forty-four years at least, it must be acknowledged that the latter policy was successful. France herself has been perfectly secure, and Europe has been at peace.

We refrain from criticising in detail the campaigns traced in this volume. On two former occasions we have followed the author through many of his earlier chapters, touching the achievements of Napoleon in Germany, and of the Duke of Wellington in Spain; and at sufficient length to indicate the merits and the defects of his military narrative. The campaign of 1814 does not reflect much glory to either belligerent; nor does its treatment bring into view any novel characteristics of

the historian. The war of 1814 is chiefly remarkable for the skill with which Napoleon long made head against an immense superiority of hostile numbers, in spite of a ruined country, a bankrupt treasury, and a demoralised army. There needs no exaggeration of previously acknowledged facts to place this campaign of Bonaparte among the most remarkable of his life. But in this, just as in other volumes, M. Thiers is at issue with nearly every previous writer, in reference to the numbers engaged on either side. We might take many instances, but two shall suffice. The author computes the French forces engaged in the battle of La Rothière at only 32,000; whereas they are generally computed at 50,000. Again, at the battle of Craonne, he reckons the French at 30,000, and the Allies at 50,000. Nearly every other writer has inverted this proportion by reckoning the French at 40,000, and the Allies at 27,000.

The campaign of 1814 is constantly quoted as one of the most brilliant examples of the military genius of Napoleon, and it is still studied in all the military schools of Europe as a model of swift and ingenious tactics in the field. This praise, if it be not exaggerated, is due to the skill with which the Emperor, commanding an army of inferior numerical force and physical strength, contrived, by alternate evolutions on the chord of an arc, to keep in check the advance of the Austrians under Schwarzenberg, and of the Prussians under Blücher. M. Thiers of course re-echoes this language of panegyric. But his own narrative demonstrates that the final catastrophe was the direct result of an error of judgment on the part of Napoleon, which would have destroyed the reputation of a less eminent strategist. As the danger became more imminent, and the determination of the Allies to prosecute their march upon Paris more manifest, Napoleon resolved to throw himself on the rear of Schwarzenberg's army, with the vain hope of stopping the progress of the invading forces. He therefore interrupted his own communications with his base of operations in the capital, and left Paris to its fate — the corps of the French army on the Marne and the Seine being entirely unable to oppose a successful resistance to the Allies. Had Napoleon himself concentrated his whole remaining force round Paris, it is clear that the capitulation of the capital would have been retarded, and he would not have been placed in the ludicrous position of learning the fall of that great city and the overthrow of his power, when he himself, with the main body of his troops, was entirely out of reach. It is evident that Napoleon himself felt the gravity of the fault he had committed, by his eagerness to correct it, even after he had reached Fontainebleau,

until the capitulation of Marmont rendered the resumption of hostilities impossible. The abandonment of the line of communication with Paris was certainly not less fatal in a political than in a military point of view, for it left the government without a head, and the army without a base.

It has been our intention on the present occasion simply to review the account given in this work of the negotiations between France and the Allies, from the time at which the latter liberated Germany to the Rhine, down to the conclusion of the general treaties by which they re-established Europe. We are well aware that M. Thiers is far too independent to admit into his writings any views but such as are intrinsically and originally his own. But we do not look upon the views which he records in this volume as the less dangerous that they are not the result of any political inspiration. His aspirations are ominous, for they seem to carry a substantive reality in their train. During near ten years of constitutional monarchy and republican government, the author preached a crusade for the restoration of the Empire, and in 1852 the Empire was restored. Nor can it be doubted that the influence of this work largely contributed to that result. He seems now to preach, by the same implication, a crusade for the restoration of what he terms the 'natural frontiers' of France. His countrymen are pre-eminently sensitive to their military honour, jealous and excitable. To tell them that for forty-six years their honour has been betrayed, is equivalent to calling upon them to rise for its vindication. M. Thiers is ambitious for his country and an enthusiast; the government of France is in the grasp of a sovereign who has also great national ambition without being an enthusiast; and though we believe that he now derides the notion that he will follow in the path indicated by the historian, it is hard to say how soon a government which affects the absolute guidance of a nation, may not in turn be led by that nation through the enthusiasm kindled by writers such as M. Thiers. France has for a century been peculiarly amenable to literary influence. M. Thiers has reserved his eighteenth vial for the battle of Waterloo and the Congress of Vienna; and we may anticipate that in 1861 he will sound a louder appeal to the national aspirations of his countrymen, and utter a fiercer rebuke for their long forbearance.

ART. XI.—1. Ἡ παλαια καὶ ἡ καινη Διαθηκη. *Vetus et Novum Testamentum ex antiquissimo codice Vaticano.* Edidit ANGELUS MAIUS, S.R.E. Card. Romæ. MDCCCLVII. 5 vols. 4to.

2. Ἡ καινη Διαθηκη. *Novum Testamentum ex vetustissimo codice Vaticano Secundis curis editum studio* ANGELI MAII, S.R.E. Card. Romæ. MDCCCLIX.

THE late Professor De Wette, while walking through the gallery of the Vatican Library, designated it 'as a magnificent mausoleum for dead books.' This description was applicable in more ways than one, for not only are all the stores of the MSS. in Latin, Greek, Syriac, and other languages, so enclosed in folding presses, that nothing indicates their literary contents, but also the more important of the volumes thus secreted are either not allowed to be used at all, or else under such restrictions, and for so few hours on certain days of the week, and that during a portion of the year, that they seem to be holy relics carefully guarded for occasional exhibition and reverence, rather than the true contents of a manuscript library — a place for the common use of all who belong to the republic of letters, or at least of all who labour in its service.

But in the Vatican Library there was one volume guarded with especial solicitude, exhibited indeed to many, but not permitted to be used by any; a volume, the value and importance of which were known not merely to Biblical critics, but to all Greek scholars and antiquaries. This book was famous as containing the oldest known copy of the Greek Testament, the text of which was generally considered to be of the highest importance; and the obstacles thrown in the way of all who sought any acquaintance with its actual contents, excited all the more chivalrous devotion on the part of those whose hearts were alive to the warmth and enthusiasm inspired by such studies. Such was the special value attached to this one MS., that to it alone has been given habitually the designation CODEX VATICANUS, as if it were *the one* distinctive treasure amongst the thousands of MS. volumes in the Pontifical Library.

This is not the only MS. which has warmed the hearts of literary knights-errant with chivalrous love. Reuchlin, in the revival of letters, wrote nearly four centuries ago to the Dominican Monks of Basle, informing them that a *fair maiden* under their tutelage had so engaged his affections, that he was sure that

he should die of love, if they did not allow him to have her as his legitimate companion for life; he added, that as the Dominican fathers were under a vow of celibacy, they could have no adequate motive for not acceding to his honourable desires: he might farther have added, that this captivating lady of his love was in sad seclusion, as her guardians were incapable of holding any communication with her in her own language. So this enchanting fair one — in other words, an exquisitely written MS. of the Greek Testament — was consigned by the Dominican fathers to the sacred custody of Reuchlin, under a covenant as sacred as the marriage bond — a covenant strictly and religiously observed, that on the demise of that scholar the MS. should be returned to Basle, where it may still be seen amongst the treasures of the library*, and where it has even of late years been collated again and again as one of the most valuable Biblical documents even now known. How highly do the scholars and university authorities of that great Swiss city (which first gave forth the New Testament *printed* and *published*) prize the MSS. in their possession, may be learned from the precautions taken for their security when used or collated. Thus during the university recess, a stranger was allowed to *use* these MSS., but it was in the house of a Professor, and the room was, for the time being, a prison; for the collator and the MS. were alike secured by lock and key. A mode of guardianship which has also been employed on Saints' days in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, when the MSS. there could not otherwise be examined.

No true scholar objects to all proper precautions being taken for the security of ancient MSS. but it is annoying to find them withheld from use, just as if their value consisted in some secret possession. Thus a century and a half ago when Montfaucon visited the Library of St. Mark, he was informed that it was derogatory to the dignity of the State of Venice for the ancient tomes to be read or copied; and thus it has been to many a Biblical scholar in more recent years in the Vatican; and thus did De Wette feel the contrast between this Roman seclusion and the permission of use, but under proper safeguards, which was the rule in his own University of Basle.

But the Vatican MS. has been published, and that too by a Roman Cardinal — a man himself of learning and research. This is therefore a suitable occasion for noticing the history of this famous Codex, the efforts made to use it, their partial

* Now marked and numbered K. iii. 3. in the library catalogue; No. 1. in the lists of Wetstein and other New Testament editors.

success, and the character of Cardinal Mai's editions; and thus we may show pretty clearly both what has been effected and what remains to be done. We know that not a few will regard with surprise the notion that Mai could leave anything still to be accomplished, at least in a work which he undertook so many years ago, and which in fact did not see the light till after his decease: how far such an *à priori* conclusion is wise or just can only be determined by facts.

The earliest public mention that we have of the Vatican MS. is in the controversies in which Erasmus was engaged soon after he published his Greek Testament. As his Latin version which stood by the side of the Greek differed in many particulars from the Vulgate, not only in phraseology, but also in reading, every opponent of the revival of letters, however innocent of all acquaintance with Greek, was able to make this Latin version the ground of complaint and invective. And especially was this the case in connexion with the text 1 John v. 7, which had then for five or six centuries established for itself a place in the Latin Vulgate; but which Erasmus, following *Greek* authorities, omitted in his two earlier editions, (1516 and 1519). For as to this passage Erasmus had received some intimation that the Greek MS. in large letters in the Papal Library did not contain it; and in appealing to its authority against its censors, he was fortified by an extract made in 1521, by Paulus Bombosius, the then Prefect of the Vatican Library; the extract showed plainly that this Papal Codex agreed with Erasmus in the *omission*, if indeed it was an omission and not a *non-insertion*.

But though Erasmus employed the Vatican Codex as his shield against the attacks made on him as to this one point, it was not long before his standard of appeal was used as that by which his own Greek Text in its general character would be tried and found wanting. The learned Spaniard Sepulveda in 1533 drew the attention of Erasmus to the diversity in the readings of his edition from that of the ancient copies, while rightly ascribing these variations to errors of transcription—a mode of dealing with the subject which shows how superior Sepulveda was both in criticism and in charity to most critics in his own age, and particularly so when compared with his countryman Stunica. But it was to the Vatican MS. especially that Sepulveda referred in proof of his point. 'Est 'enim Græcum exemplar antiquissimum in Bibliothecâ Vaticanâ 'in quo diligentissime et accuratissime litteris majusculis con-'scriptum utrumque Testamentum continetur longe diversum a

'vulgatis exemplaribus.'*. He then gives intelligent reasons for valuing highly the text found in this MS.; he states that in very many passages he had noticed that it retained the genuine and ancient reading where the common Greek copies differed. Sepulveda's critical skill was considerably in advance of his time; and he employed his sojourn at Rome, from whence he was then writing, and the access which he enjoyed to the Vatican Library, to good and intelligent purpose. Erasmus in reply had nothing better to allege than the supposed 'Fœdus 'cum Græcis,'† said to have been agreed on at the Florentine Council, (by which it was alleged to have been determined that Greek MSS. should be *altered* to suit the Latin), and the assumed fact that Stunica had edited the Complutensian New Testament from MSS. supplied by the Papal Library, which generally agreed with his own text. To this Sepulveda rightly answered that whatever might be said about decrees of the Florentine Council, nothing that had taken place in 1439 could affect a MS. existing for ages previous.

Thus, almost as soon as the Greek Testament had first appeared in print, a certain degree of celebrity attached to the Vatican MS., both on the ground of its acknowledged antiquity and also because of the goodness of its readings. It may seem strange that no effort was then made to publish it. This may have arisen partly from the singular apathy with which the Greek Testament has been treated at Rome in all ages prior to the present; and partly from the fact that as the Papal sanction had been given both to the Complutensian and Erasmian texts, there might have been a fear lest the issue of a Vatican text differing much from these should furnish an occasion of objection to those whose efforts were then so strenuously directed against all claims of Papal authority.

* Joannis Genesii Sepulvedæ Opera: Matriti, 1780. (iii. 81.) But little of the correspondence between Erasmus and Sepulveda is to be found amongst the epistles of the former; hence Wetstein and others supposed that letters had been lost, which are not only extant, but also important as relating to curious points of literary history.

† The notion of Erasmus was that the '*Fœdus cum Græcis*' was an article agreed on by the Florentine Council in 1439, that the Greeks should alter their MSS. to suit the Latin Vulgate. But in the course of his correspondence with Sepulveda, it appeared that the whole notion had sprung entirely from an incorrect remark made to Erasmus (about 1520) by Tonstall, Bishop of Durham. See, for a further notice of this subject, the Introduction to Dr. Tregelles' treatise on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, which forms the fourth volume of the last edition of Horne's Introduction to the Holy Scriptures.

We have no knowledge whatever of the manner in which this MS. was added to the Papal library; it is, however, most probable that it formed a part of that collection soon after the Bibliotheca Vaticana was instituted by Nicholas V., and that the additions to this Codex to supply the defects caused by time, which belong apparently to about that age, were made in order to complete the volume for that purpose.*

How highly this MS. was esteemed in the sixteenth century is shown by the use made of it for the Roman edition of the LXX in 1586. This Roman text before long established itself as the Textus Receptus of that ancient Greek version to the exclusion of the Aldine which previously occupied that place; and if the Roman editors had extended their labours by publishing the New Testament also from the MS. before them, then the Vatican text might equally have superseded that of Robert Stephens (based on the last edition of Erasmus), and might have prevented even the appearance of the Elzevir text with its proud claim 'Textus ab omnibus receptus.' As it was, however, it was long before anything was really known as to its general text and specific readings. A few extracts made in the sixteenth century were all that had been published as really taken from it; a notion, however, prevailed in some quarters that the New Testament in the Complutensian Polyglott was based upon it — an opinion entirely opposed to the facts of the case.

We have now to speak of the steps taken from time to time to use the Codex Vaticanus up to the actual publication of Cardinal Mai's edition.

In 1669, Bartolocci (well known as the author of the Bibliotheca Rabbinnica) made a collation, a transcript of which is preserved in the Bibliothèque at Paris; it has never been printed, but several critics have copied it for their own use; its defects and omissions are many, but it has value in confirming and checking the collations of others. In Toinard's Harmonia Evangelica (Paris, 1707) the Greek text is not that of the common editions; but it is one which the editor formed from the readings which he had obtained of two Roman MSS., of which *this* was one, when compared with the Latin Vulgate; the coincidence of the old Greek and Latin readings had in

* We must again refer our readers to Dr. Tregelles' volume, p. 158., for a more particular account of this remarkable manuscript, and the singular marks and corrections upon it. As in the celebrated 'Perkins Shakspeare,' many of these marks are obviously in a more modern cursive hand: yet certainly this fact has never been used to impugn the anthenticity of the MS.

Toinard's judgment a preponderating weight.* This seems to have been the first real *use* that was made of the Vatican MS. Not many years subsequently, Bentley, who led the way in what has since been called comparative criticism, as applied to the Greek Testament, obtained a collation of this MS. to be made for him by an Italian named Mico; and, at a later period, he procured a re-examination of the corrections of different hands from the Abbate Rulotta. Mico's collation, however, remained unpublished till 1799; and Rulotta's notes are still amongst the unprinted papers of Bentley in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. More successful was the Danish scholar Birch, who collated the MS. (except the gospels of Luke and John, in which parts he obtained a copy of that made by Mico), and who at different times, from 1788 to 1801, published the results, together with the collations of other MSS. These collations gave us, till recently, all the information that we possessed as to this most precious MS. Some indeed examined it from time to time, and perhaps noted a word or two. While it was at Paris, under the rule of Napoleon, it was examined and described by Hug; its antiquity was demonstrated, and inquiries were called forth which could not be satisfied after it had left the shelves of the Imperial Library (the mark and stamp of which it still bears) to return to the palace that gives it its designation.

To detail the endeavours made by one scholar after another to obtain proper access to this treasure of the Vatican would only be the recital of the repulses received by ardent lovers, not indeed on the part of the object of their affections, but from her tonsured and jealous guardians. For thirty years, however, there had floated through Europe a rumour that Mai, then librarian of the Vatican, had undertaken the publication of the whole of the contents of this MS. At length the report assumed a more definite shape and form; though there was something contradictory in the very definiteness of the accounts: indeed, it seemed difficult to believe that they all could relate to one and the same object. Thus, in 1836, Dr. Wiseman announced that the New Testament was then finished, and that the Old was far advanced; he also stated that Mai had recommenced the work on a different plan after having advanced as far as St. Mark's Gospel. Sometimes we

* To those who know what the critical principles of Bentley were, it will be evident that those of Toinard accorded with them in a great degree, and even anticipated them. There is no reason for supposing that Bentley borrowed from Toinard.

heard of a facsimile edition; others spoke of a publication based on the various Roman MSS., and exhibiting the various readings at the foot of the page. In the 'Annales de la Philosophie Chrétienne' for April, 1842, a very explicit account appeared, in which we were told that

'The illustrious Cardinal Angelo Mai has just finished a work on which he has been engaged for more than ten years, viz., an edition of the New Testament, with the variations of all the MSS. found in the principal libraries of Rome and of the rest of Italy, and with numerous notes full of philological researches. The text taken by the Cardinal for the basis of his edition, is that of the celebrated MS. numbered 1209 in the library of the Vatican, which is dated as far back as the sixth century. At the suggestion of his Eminence the Roman government has resolved to publish at its own expense a facsimile of that MS., which is in golden uncial letters and in the continuous style of writing (*scriptio continua*); that is to say, the words are not separated by spaces. The celebrated engraver Ruspi has been ordered to engrave on copper plates this facsimile, copies of which are to be transmitted to all the sovereigns of Christendom.'

This account is certainly definite enough, though the writer, by mentioning '*golden* uncial letters,' showed that he had no very exact acquaintance with the subject that he was discussing.* He evidently speaks of two editions, one of a critical character, the other an engraved facsimile, the work of 'the celebrated 'engraver Ruspi.' The minuteness of the specification of circumstances reminds one of the little definite points which give the notion of truthfulness and personal knowledge to the fictions of De Foe.

Baron von Bunsen saw the Cardinal's five volumes printed in common Greek type, and not in any sense a facsimile edition: so, too, Tischendorf a few years later; while others said that they were shown Mai's *facsimile edition* in the Vatican in large folio printed in *two* columns.† In 1846 Dr. Tregelles was told by Mai himself (who refused to show his printed volumes), that his work would be a Greek testament formed for general use, 'comme l'édition Anglaise de Mill.' All these different statements were very puzzling; and the question was often

* In assigning the MS. to the *sixth* century instead of the *fourth*, he seemed to be unaware of the usual judgment of scholars. Of course he had not seen the MS. itself.

† This amusing piece of confusion arose from some having seen the edition of the 'Codex Alexandrinus' in the Vatican library, and not understanding the difference between one *codex* and another, they thought that if a facsimile of a *codex* at all, it must *then* be that of the 'Codex Vaticanus.' Some did ask very innocently, 'How, as 'the MS. is in *three* columns, is the facsimile edition in *two*?'

asked, whether there were not some hindrance on the part of the Papal authorities to the publication being permitted: these surmises were not weakened, from the jealous care with which the Vatican Codex itself was withheld from the use of all critics and scholars.

At length when the Pope had withdrawn from Rome in 1849, Cardinal Mai offered the impression of his mysterious work to Mr. Asher, the Jewish publisher of Berlin. That gentleman declined to risk the purchase; but, from the accounts which he gave orally from time to time, it was known what kind of a work it was. Mr. Asher was deterred by two causes; he considered that the terms demanded by the Cardinal (or by his *homme d'affaires*, Don Domenico Mostacci on his behalf) were too high; and he also noticed that in Mai's own copy which Mostacci showed him, there were so many corrections made with a pen, that he mistrusted the accuracy of the impression, and he feared that thus it might remain unsold in his hands.

After the return of Pius IX. to Rome, and when the Cardinal had again taken up his abode in the Palazzo Altieri, his literary activity was great, but still the Vatican edition did not make its appearance; and on his death in 1854, it seemed doubtful if it were not consigned to permanent oblivion. But in 1857 Vercellone put forth an anticipative preface describing the edition; and in a few months the whole work, in five large volumes, made its appearance. The description which Vercellone gives of the mode in which the edition was prepared, is highly curious. He says that it was 'strange and almost incredible.' In 1828, we are informed, Mai undertook the publication, and by ten years afterwards the five volumes were completed. But when all this had been accomplished, Mai found or noticed that the edition was not sufficiently accurate; and as to the volumes containing the Old Testament, this was only what might have been expected from the strange plan adopted. Vercellone tells us that the compositors were directed to take a common copy of the LXX, and that the text so set up was to be turned into that of the Vatican MS. by the press corrector, who was to read it all with the Codex. The sheets were then sent back to the printer, and it was *his* business to introduce the readings so marked into the text, or at least into the margin. There is no reason to suppose that even this measure of care was bestowed upon the New Testament. Mai, finding the inaccuracy of his work, set himself to amend it by employing a person to read the printed text aloud while he had the MS. itself before him, and then he corrected in his own copy the errors

that he thus noticed. This was the state of affairs when Mai's death took place in 1854. But in May 1857 Cardinal Altieri, one of his executors, put the matter into Vercellone's hands, and before the end of June the Preface was issued. He says that he still found errors remaining; one hundred pages were obliged to be cancelled, and several corrections were made by erasure throughout the whole impression, and other letters were stamped in.

This edition has commanded much attention, from the very nature of the subject, and the mystery which had been thrown for centuries over the oldest known MS. of the Holy Scriptures; but all the defects which Vercellone had led the critical world to expect, are there. There is nothing to raise a suspicion of intentional dishonesty, but the lack of care and want of judgment are manifest. The additions introduced from other MSS. to supply, not only the defects in the Vatican Codex produced through the injuries of time, but also the passages which this most ancient authority never did contain, exhibit a great want of judgment; and as to the execution, after all that had been done, there are pages which look like proofsheets, examined by no one but a rather unintelligent compositor. Those who have compared Mai's edition with the previously existing collections, find that in several places the reading of the common text is retained through mere oversight.

Yet, although this edition adds no credit to Mai as a critic or scholar, and exhibits him in almost as unfavourable a light as did his wholesale and unacknowledged appropriation of the notes of Canon Cureton, on the 'Festal Epistles of Athanasius,' — it has a considerable value to critical scholars, as a contribution to their acquaintance with the Vatican Text of the New Testament. If compared carefully with the published collations of Birch and Bentley (and especially with the latter as found in Mico's handwriting, in Trinity College Library), and with the MS. collation of Bartolocci at Paris, and the MS. re-examination of passages by Rulotta, then Mai's work has often a determining value: for though it frequently requires correction itself, it repeatedly shows which of the preceding collators had seen and copied rightly.

Vercellone informs us that Mai was but little satisfied with his completed edition: probably he knew its defects so well that he had no wish to see it in the hands of the public; and thus, perhaps, the supposed Papal hindrances originated with Mai himself. But he devised, and at least began, another impression of the New Testament portion. This appeared (also under Vercellone's editorial care) in 1859. In accuracy it is

a great improvement on its predecessor, and it confirms the strictures which the former edition had called forth. But even yet readings which we know are *not* those of the MS. are retained.

Vercellone announces that every facility will be given by the authorities of the Vatican for the execution of a *fac-simile* edition. Until such a work shall appear the Vatican Library will still in some measure deserve the name given it by De Wette: it still will be a magnificent mausoleum; even though some portions of the buried treasures have been dug up. We are only, as it were, in possession of the first glimpses of the inhumed wealth, and we have to wait for such exhaustive researches as those of Layard and Botta in another field of buried remains.

We have discussed the Vatican MS. historically and not critically: on the latter point we do not now touch; except, indeed, to say that the antiquity of the Codex is a demonstrated fact;—that it does belong to the age prior to the systematic correction of the sacred text, and that this is known on palæographic and other grounds. Those only who seem to be incapable of inquiring into such a subject have doubted or denied this. But there are men, as Bentley long ago remarked, who take the more recent MSS. for the older.

It is difficult to speak of the Codex Vaticanus without making some allusion to the MS. recently found at Mount Sinai, by Professor Tischendorf, and now removed to St. Petersburg. This MS. in antiquity vies with the Vatican Codex; for this was an admitted fact before any part of it was known, except the portion of the Old Testament, which has been at Leipsic for the last sixteen years. Tischendorf states that the text of the New Testament in it is of the same class as that of the Vatican MS., but he gives no particulars. Its publication is, therefore, much to be wished; and it is probable that its indefatigable discoverer may himself bring out such a *fac-simile* edition, as shall be worthy of one of the most precious monuments of Biblical antiquity. But though we do not know the readings of Tischendorf's Codex, those who are acquainted with textual criticism can feel sure what their general character must be in a document of that age. We may well be impatient for further acquaintance with this MS.; and it is much to be hoped that some experienced collator may thoroughly examine the original, so that we shall not have to wait the length of time that publication of the text must necessarily take. Such a collation, so far from being detrimental, would be beneficial to the subsequent *fac-simile* edition.

ART. XII.—1. *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform.* By JOHN STUART MILL. Second edition, with additions. London: 1859.

2. *The Practical Results of the Reform Act of* 1832. By Sir JOHN WALSH, Bart., M.P. London: 1859.

WHEN we last discussed the question how votes at elections should be taken, the great Reform Bill of 1832 had recently been passed, and the first election under it had just taken place.* Occurring as that election did in the heat of a political excitement which has known no parallel since, it was not surprising that the new franchise should have been exposed to every blast of influence which could be brought to bear upon it; and that the unrestrained and discreditable abuse of the rights of property by which it was marked should loudly have called for redress. Even then, however, we gave a moderate but decided verdict against the Ballot. Subsequent consideration has confirmed our views, and the interval, after some oscillations of opinion, appears to have decided the fate of this once popular creed — a creed which has never, as we think, been brought to the test of principle or of practice with the rigour it deserves. The renewal of the discussions on the question of Reform has suggested to us to take the opportunity of recurring, probably for the last time, to the question of open or secret voting.

We speak of the Ballot as a question of decreasing importance and ebbing popularity, not because any reaction has occurred in the public mind adverse to measures of real liberality, but because argument has weakened rather than strengthened the convictions formerly entertained by many sound Liberals on this subject; and the time is not far distant when the delusions once prevailing upon it will be regarded as old-fashioned and obsolete. Higher authority in support of this view can hardly be quoted than that of the eminent writer whose 'Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform' we have placed at the head of this article. In the course of this essay Mr. Mill observes: —

'I hope to show sufficient reasons why the Ballot should be included, not among the things which ought, but among those which ought not, to form part of a measure for reforming the representation. It appears to me that secret suffrage, a very right and justifiable demand when originally made, would at present, and still more in time to come, produce far greater evil than good.

* Edin. Rev. vol. lvi. p. 543 (January, 1833).

'The operation of the Ballot is, that it enables the voter to give full effect to his own private preferences, whether selfish or disinterested, under no inducement to defer to the opinions or wishes of others, except as these may influence his own. It follows, so the friends of the Ballot have always said, that secrecy is desirable in cases in which the motives acting on the voter through the will of others, are likely to mislead him; while, if left to his own preferences, he would vote as he ought. It equally follows, and is also the doctrine of the friends of the Ballot, that where the voter's own preferences are apt to lead him wrong, but the feeling of responsibility to others may keep him right, not secrecy, but publicity, should be the rule.

'Thirty years ago it was still true that in the election of members of Parliament, the main evil to be guarded against was that which the Ballot would exclude,—coercion by landlords, employers, and customers. At present, I conceive, a much greater source of evil is the selfishness, or the selfish partialities, of the voter himself. A "base and mischievous vote" is now, I am convinced, much oftener given from the voter's personal interest, or class interest, or some mean feeling in his own mind, than from any fear of consequences at the hands of others; and to these evil influences the Ballot would enable him to yield himself up, free from all sense of shame or responsibility.' (*Mill*, p. 29–31.)

'There are mony things in this world,' says the sagacious Andrew Fairservice, 'ower bad for blessing, and ower gude 'for banning, like Rob Roy.' Such is the true character of the Ballot. It has been blessed by its friends, and banned by its foes, with an intensity of faith or of fear with which its own merits or demerits have probably little connexion. Like that of many men and things, its reputation has been founded much more on what it professed to be able to do, than on any real ability to come up to its pretensions. Its avowed mission is to destroy bribery, and intimidation, and all undue influence over the voters of this land. Of course Liberal politicians, who are presumed to hate such unrighteous doings with all their heart, bow down before the purity of the Ballot, without much inquiry into its right to be admitted among our electoral gods. Conservatives, or Tories, or Aristocrats, or whatever their name may now be, who are supposed to find their account in influencing the individual suffrages of the people, are scared by the loud blast of the Ballot trumpet, as schoolboys are by the bay of a watch-dog, merely because it is his profession to bark and bite; while perhaps the good-natured mastiff, when off his chain, is as harmless and as fond of play as any of them.

One of the most ill-founded of the pretensions of the Ballot is that of novelty. People speak of it as if it had been left for

this nineteenth century to discover that votes might be taken in secret, and seem to think that in this respect it resembles Free Trade, or Toleration, or the other large principles of government which have been only gradually developed by the expanding civilisation of our times. But this is to do the Ballot great injustice. Its merits in theory, and its benefits in practice, were thoroughly known, discussed, and tested centuries before Bentham or Berkeley existed: and probably, from the dispersion at Babel downwards, there never has been a question decided by the votes of a community, without its being considered and determined whether those votes should be given publicly or secretly. The abstract merits of the proposal have accordingly been discussed by writers of all ages, and secret voting has been used or rejected in governments of all shades of principle. Cicero, in his treatise *De Legibus*, argues the question by way of dialogue, and rather gives the preference to the Ballot,* though there is a passage in the fragment *De Republicâ* against it. He thinks that the suffrages should be '*optimatibus nota, populo libera*,'—a kind of modified ballot. Montesquieu, on the other hand, lays it down that open voting ought to be *fundamental in democracy*. Free Rome rejected secret voting. Imperial Rome adopted it. It found friends in oligarchic Venice, and possesses them now in democratic America, arbitrary France, and the nascent freedom and swelling energies of Australia. One great example, however, is ranged on the other side. Never at any period of our history, under Plantagenet or Tudor, under Stuarts, or under the Commonwealth, even in the most rampant form of unrestrained English liberty, have we hitherto had anything to say to secret voting at elections. This of course is not conclusive, but it rather suggests that history and experience give us no reason to assume with confidence that secret voting will promote civil liberty, and leaves it to the friends of the Ballot to establish grounds for reversing the deliberate sentence of the last three centuries among ourselves.

To the consideration of this question we propose to devote a few pages, and we mean to try to elucidate, not the theoretical but the practical results of secret voting as compared with open voting. It must be borne in mind that the proposition we are to consider has no necessary connexion with bribery or influence

* The classics of this controversy are now stale enough. But those of our readers who may have any curiosity on the subject, may be well pleased to have the following references:—Cicero, 'De Legibus,' iii. 16, 17; 'De Amicitia,' 12.; Pliny's 'Ep.,' iii. 20.; Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall,' c. 44.

at elections. It involves a change of the whole system. We are all to vote in secret, and no one is to know how any elector votes. It is the more important to bear this in mind, because the promoters of the Ballot are very apt to forget that there are worse things in Government than the bribery and influence which go on at our elections. They are bad and base enough; but, after all, they are weeds which spring up on the soil of liberty. If we had no votes, no one would bribe us; if no one cared how we voted, influence and intimidation would be effectually cured. It would be spendthrift husbandry to endanger the fruits, in destroying the weeds which are thrown up by the strength and richness of the soil; and therefore by considering the probable effects of secret voting, apart from bribery and undue influence, we shall the better be able to judge of what we are going to purchase, and the price we are likely to pay for it.

But there can be no doubt, at the same time, that if secret voting could be expected with any reasonable certainty, to accomplish the destruction, or a substantial diminution of corruption at elections, the inquiry would start with an immense advantage in favour of the proposition. It is indeed a singular instance of the extent to which conventional rules will overbear the plainest and simplest dictates of common honesty, to find men of respectability, nay even men of station, conniving at an offence not more respectable than shop-lifting, and not much less nefarious than highway robbery. We do not speak of bribery merely, which, infamous as it is, stands in our opinion higher in the scale than some other offences of the same kind. The worst, the most pitiful and most disgraceful of such offenders, is the man who uses his position or his influence to coerce or compel an elector to vote against his inclination. The right to vote without coercion or restraint is the property of the elector; the law secures it to him, just as much as it does his purse to the traveller; and the man who tries to take from him the free exercise of that right, is in his heart no better than a thief. When society, which is so very capricious as to the crimes it will punish and those it will permit, comes to apply to one set of thieves the same justice which it deals out to the other, we may have some hope of seeing freedom of election put on a firm and substantial basis. If voting in secret will do anything to cure the evil, it is entitled to a most favourable reception from all lovers of liberty; and therefore we shall begin by inquiring shortly how far such a benefit is likely to result from it.

Mr. Tom Taylor, in his lively piece called the 'Contested

'Election,' hit off, two seasons ago, to the London play-going public, the phases of a contest for a corrupt borough with much spirit and success. The Lions and the Lambs, which formed the bribable balance of the constituency of Flamborough, may be found, by those who know where to look for them, in every general election. We shall suppose the Ballot established, with a gloom as impenetrable as its best friends could wish. A candidate, full of enthusiasm for his country's good, comes down to canvass the once corrupt, but now purified constituency. Ungilded merit will now, he trusts, weigh as much in the scale as the longest purse, and the electors will be left to the unbiassed dictates of their natural intelligence. So thinks the candidate, as the train whirls him on to the scene of his expected triumphs. But is it so? Will the five pounds a-head which used to buy the Lions and the Lambs too, now buy them no more? Let us leave the ardent aspirant in his train, and see what is going on in Flamborough the while.

In the same dingy tap-room, in the same back street, where the little business of corruption used to be transacted, sits the same election agent, with the same philosopher and friend who used to represent the Lions. There are a hundred Lions, and he used to have 500*l.* to bribe them with. He has his 500*l.* this time also, and he proceeds to dispose of it. 'You are 'aware,' he says, 'we must not now know how you and the 'Lions vote. I cannot know, and you cannot know how any 'Lion votes: the Act of Parliament forbids it, and of course, 'we respect the law.' The old Lion probably looks grim at this. 'But there is no reason why we should not understand 'each other as we used to do. Here are 100*l.*—apply them to 'feed the Lions as you think best—and if MY CONSTITUENT 'IS ELECTED, the other 400*l.* will reach you through the old 'channel.' Does any one imagine that the secrecy of their votes will make the Lions one whit less ravenous for the prey thus set before them? The corrupt influence is as vigorous as ever. 'Virtue, though in rags,' has as little chance as ever, the only difference being that the candidate gets off more cheaply if he loses his election, and each Lion becomes the canvasser for other men's votes, as well as the merchant of his own.

Such is a rude sketch of a possible plan of bribery under the Ballot. The details might easily be improved by more scientific hands, but the drawing indicates with sufficient distinctness how easily the result may be attained.

We recollect a case before an Election Committee, disclosing another system of electoral corruption equally worthy

of praise for its simplicity and efficiency. A gentleman belonging to a borough had a fancy for lending money to the electors, in small sums of 10*l.*, 20*l.*, or 30*l.* He took reasonable interest, and called up his loans at pleasure, and whenever an election came on, gave a general notice to his debtors to pay up, unless they were prepared to support *his* candidate. What arrangement he made with his candidate of course cannot be known; but it may be easily surmised what course the parties in this financial transaction, profitable as it was to all concerned, were likely to take. Now the Ballot would not derange, in the slightest degree, the principle on which a borough might thus be bought and sold. As the money-lending was only resorted to as a means of selling the borough, it would cease when that became impossible; and the capitalist would simply inform his clients that if, under the Ballot, his candidate was not returned, their connexion in business must come to an end. There can be little doubt what the effect of such an intimation would be.

Nor is there reason to think that the more indirect forms of corrupt influence would find themselves in any degree restrained under secret voting. The ship-owning member, for instance, of the seaport of Langsands has been in the habit of consolidating his interest in the High Gate by many judicious orders for ship stores to the free and independent electors who deal in these commodities. The shroud of the Ballot might spread a temporary veil between him and his supporters; but it is not necessary on that account that his acts of benevolence should cease. He cannot, indeed, be sure how Tomkins votes. But he can be quite sure how Tomkins speaks and acts. He can make quite sure that he shall canvass all the High Gate in his company, act on his committee, publish throughout Langsands how important it is that he should be returned; and Tomkins stands so deservedly high in the borough that these services are far more valuable than his vote, and are not too highly rewarded by the contract for supplying the new steamer then on the stocks.

Latterly, the advocates of the Ballot have almost confessed, as well they may, that they have little hope of shutting out bribery by the device of secret voting. The golden shower will find a path, and no bolts or bars can exclude it. But they think that the Ballot may be expected to act as a protection to the honest voter against undue and corrupt interference with his freedom in giving his vote, and from unjust persecution consequent on its exercise. Now, as we have said already, this is by far the basest and meanest form of political corruption. It is bad enough to buy or bribe a knave, but it is ten times worse

to punish a honest man for his honesty. But we cannot see that things would in this respect be at all improved by the Ballot. Perhaps, at starting, before undue influence had recovered from the shock, its accustomed engines might be at fault. But in the end, we suspect, the experiment would only result in increasing the evil, and in giving another turn to the screw which landlords, and landlords' agents, and masters and overseers, now so unscrupulously and nefariously use.

We shall suppose that the traditional Tory squire, the fine old English gentleman, has heard with indignation that Parliament has deprived him of the means of knowing how any one of his tenants is to vote. He is frantic at the Radical, revolutionary, republican proceeding, and he hastily proceeds to take counsel with his land steward as to what is to be done in such a crisis of our history. But he is speedily consoled. His bailiff assures him that things are not so bad as he thinks, and that he will have, without difficulty, that information to which the rights of property so justly entitle him. An election is at hand. One by one the tenants receive a visit—a very friendly visit—from the bailiff. They are told which of the candidates has the good wishes of the squire, and, half pleasantly and half sternly, they are requested or required to give him their support, and to act on his local committee. The result is quite certain. Those whose hearts go with their landlord, or those who fear the bailiff, or those who are indifferent, will at once give the desired promise. Those who refuse, and those who hesitate, are carefully remembered next rent day.

It is true that, excepting the word of an English yeoman, the landlord has no security that the promise will be kept. The promise may be broken; and we cannot see that purity of election has gained much by that result. But, sooner or later, the truth will come out. The bird of the air, or the wife of his bosom, or the Three Jolly Pigeons in the village, will carry the matter. The bailiff will soon know who are the true men, and who the traitors; nor will it improve the tenant's position if certainty give place to suspicion, and his innocence of giving an honest vote be confounded, amid the darkness of the Ballot, in the punishment which descends on the real delinquents. In vain will he protest that he voted against his principles, and with his landlord. The Ballot-box has engulphed his vote, and no spell or charm can compel it to give evidence in his favour. There was once a worthy farmer in Liddesdale who was very much of our mind on this part of the subject. He was a great Radical, and a capital speaker at meetings of the Liberal party. But he had a Tory landlord, and always voted with him. He

was asked, on one occasion, whether he would not rejoice if he could have the Ballot. 'Ballot!' said he, 'I'm for none of 'your Ballot: the factor wad be aye suspecting me of voting 'accordin' to my conscience.'

It is, therefore, vain and hopeless to expect that any substantial remedy for this kind of coercion will be found in the secrecy of the vote. Something perhaps, especially at first, the Ballot might effect in this direction, and in individual cases it might produce the desired result. It would certainly make intimidation more difficult, more expensive and more inconvenient, and therefore those who practise these unworthy arts will continue to object to their movements being so disturbed. But we very much fear that in the end, the last state of the constituencies would be worse than the first. Influence would percolate through the electors by more occult and subtle crevices, but in as great abundance as ever: while the stings of jealous suspicion would add sharpness and severity to social oppression.

All this, however, is only a vain looking into futurity, and therefore inconclusive. It is of no avail to say that the Ballot will not cure corruption. The answer, and the fair answer is, How can you tell until you try? We entirely admit the rejoinder, and concede at once that all these speculations and misgivings would be of no weight at all, against the trial of the experiment, if this country had only to consider how to put corruption down. What we have been trying hitherto to prove is, not that the bargain may not be worth making, but that the article cannot be warranted. It is not what it professes to be, a patent bribe-destroyer. The question still remains, and it is the only question we care about, what is the price we are to pay for it, and shall we get value for our money?

The inquiry therefore to which we now desire the attention of the legislature and the country is, how far secret voting truly belongs to popular or to arbitrary government? Is its tendency to increase or to diminish the power and influence of the people? Will the popular voice receive more powerful or more feeble expression through the Ballot-box? Are the elements of influence, opinion, incentive, and control, which prevail under it, those of the fresh uplands of freedom, or of the dead level of arbitrary power? This is really the only question we have the slightest interest to consider, and if the answer be in the direction of liberty, we are all for the Ballot. Whether it be English or un-English, so it will do any of its work, and be sound at heart, in the name of honesty, let it be tried.

But this question which we have put must first be answered. For we are not dealing merely with knaves with purses, and knaves without them — not only with frowning thanes and crouching serfs. What is proposed is that all of us, who may have no purses and yet be no knaves, or may have them and desire to buy no one, shall vote in secret. We are not ashamed or afraid of our vote.

> 'This or that man's frown I fear not;
> Him I love that loveth me,
> For the rest, a pin I care not.'

But still, we must vote in the dark. This remedy, therefore, must be swallowed by all — those who require it and those who do not, just as the crowds that frequent Homburg or Kissingen, merely for diversion or excitement, are set to drink waters which are unpleasant to the taste and questionable in their hygienic results.

The first fact that meets us is that we are required to submit to this process of concealment merely to expiate the sins of a very small minority. If all the men, capable of being bought or bullied were numbered, they would make up a very minute proportion of any constituency. They may, to be sure, and they very often do, make up a number large enough to turn an election, and therefore they attract an amount of attention not accorded to their honest neighbours. But still, the great majority is honest. It is more than honest, it is intelligent and public-spirited. We should gain very little if we broke the spirit of the independent majority, in trying to reclaim the outcasts of our smaller boroughs, or to repress the stolid tyranny of a few præ-Canningite country gentlemen. The main truth with which we start is, that the great majority do not need the Ballot, and therefore it is the more necessary to ascertain what good the Ballot is expected to do them.

First, as to the manner, general order, and procedure in elections. If we are to have secret voting, the dropping of a ball or a ticket into a box must end all inquiry. Parliament must renounce, for good and all, the right of scrutiny. That superintending check, under which at present every vote is given, must be absolutely and permanently surrendered. As no Committee of the House of Commons can ask, or if they ask can be told, how any man voted, of course they cannot scrutinise any election. Not that (peace to the shade of Sir Cecil Wray) we should like to see the Westminster scrutiny repeated every Parliament, but the power and privilege of scrutiny is very high among the rights of the House of Com-

mons, and is and has been a more potent barrier against influence than the Ballot can pretend to be.

A petition, we shall suppose, is presented to the House of Commons, complaining that at an election 150 bad votes were received. The House, no doubt, may entertain the petition, send it to a Committee, and ascertain the fact. But what then? The Committee may find that 150 bad votes were given. But for whom they were given the Ballot forbids them to discover. They may all have been given for the sitting member, and thus the sitting member may have no right to sit. But they may all have been given against him; and thus the sitting member may have a better right to sit than he supposed. An election, we shall say, turns on a single vote. A. offers to prove, and does prove, that one voter who was dead was personated. What then? B. declares that he must have voted against him; and the Committee cannot possibly tell how he voted.

Now we cannot consider this abdication of the constitutional right of scrutiny as a light or unimportant matter. The possibility of inquiry is always an influential element in preserving honest administration; and if it were once certain that no inquiry whatever could be made into the truth of the result declared by the sheriff at an election, we can conceive the consequence to be a course of systematic and inscrutable corruption infinitely worse than any of the evils the Ballot is intended to cure. It is only by occasional, but searching, judicial investigations into individual cases of corruption in particular boroughs that the truth can be ascertained. The Ballot would render such investigations impossible. The Ballot would therefore secure impunity to every species of fraud or corrupt influence brought to bear upon an election under its tutelary shade.

It is said that our Australian friends have invented a way under which a vote may be taken in secret, and may yet on a scrutiny become known. But that is not secret voting, and may be very easily shown to be destructive of secret voting; because if all votes objected to with a view to a parliamentary scrutiny were to become known, the Ballot would become a farce, and there never would be the slightest difficulty in discovering how any individual elector voted. But it is well that the advocates of Ballot should mark this one illustration at least of the dangers of absolute secrecy.

Nor let it be forgotten that while with one hand we are about to destroy the power of inquiry, with the other we propose to inaugurate a system of voting which has its own new and special tendencies to corrupt dealing. We are far from saying that the ordinary machinery of the Ballot may not be so ad-

justed as to give reasonable security for its fair and honest working; nor do we doubt that, as far as mere mechanism is concerned, its general results would generally be fair and honest. Yet it is worth a moment's consideration what vast interests we propose to entrust to mere mechanism, while we deprive them of the safeguards and protection of publicity. There is no machine which the wit of man ever contrived, which the wit of some other man will not contrive to evade. Look at the wonderful and complicated frauds which have so often occurred under the Excise laws. Cases have been frequent of devices to cheat the revenue, accomplished by the most ingenious, occult, and unsuspected contrivances, under circumstances in which it seemed impossible to doubt the accuracy and honesty of the results apparently arrived at. We know no reason why a ballot-box should be any exception. In nine cases out of ten, or ninety-nine out of the hundred, the ballot would be faithfully taken, and its results duly recorded. But if in the tenth or the hundredth instance it were not so, see how great a blow would be struck at the very roots of our liberties. At present the results of an election are public. Every man in each polling booth can add up the numbers for himself. They are telegraphed by the rival committees from hour to hour. If returns differ, the poll-books are there to correct them; every man can identify his own vote, and can be identified by it; and the sheriff, in declaring the numbers, is subject to the supervision and watchfulness of persons as well informed as himself. But what are we to do, if things go wrong under the Ballot? We are at the mercy of the box, and of those who keep it. If the box is out of order, or its keepers out of honesty, we are helpless. If there is a mistake about numbers, we are entirely in the power of those who count them; and if they are bought, or bribed, or careless, or drunk, or confused, there can be no redress. Even if this were never to occur, how is public confidence to be established in these mechanical results, amid the contests, jealousies, suspicions, and malice of an election; and if public confidence were once shaken in the truth of them, public confidence would from that hour be withdrawn from Parliament and its deliberations.

These speculations are not devoid of some foundation in experience. From all we have heard, the responses of the ballot-box in America are not implicitly trusted; and there are not wanting those who declare that in France the electoral urn, like other great public functionaries, has instructions to speak only those things which are agreeable.

It is therefore easy to see that all the frauds, mistakes, and

impostures against which a Parliamentary scrutiny is at present the constitutional remedy, will be far more easily perpetrated, and utterly incapable of detection, under secret voting. At present, many corrupt practices of this kind are rendered useless by the mere power of inquiry. What they might grow to under the Ballot it is impossible to foresee. But it is certain that our first act in adopting Vote by Ballot will be to abandon a great constitutional safeguard for purity of election, not only without any security against the abuses which it is most useful in preventing, but at a time at which increased and new facilities are to be afforded to the perpetration of them.

Indeed, obvious as all this is as regards the general faithfulness and honesty of election returns, it is particularly and palpably obvious in that department of corruption of which the Ballot-box is supposed to be the cure. Let us suppose a petition against an election return under the Ballot, on the ground of bribery. How are we to proceed? That the voter got the money is but half the case. How are we to prove that he gave his vote? We try a man for suborning perjury; but we must not prove what the witness swore. We try a man for procuring assassination; but we are forbidden to inquire whether any one was assassinated. If Brown, Jones, and Robinson are three committeemen, and Jones gradually grows shy of attendance and ambiguous in speech, is seen in unwonted company, and at last votes openly against his colours and his conscience, Brown and Robinson have at least a clue to the reason why. But under the ballot Jones may be quite at ease. He may smoke his pipe, drink his beer, shout his three times three to the last, march up to the ballot-box with his brothers in arms, and betray them without suspicion. A Committee of the House of Commons may find that he received 5*l.* from Mr. Tamper's agent that morning, but they never can find that he sold his vote, for which way, after all, was his vote given?

So much for the matter of scrutiny, as to which it is for our readers to say whether we gain or lose by the proposed bargain. For our own part, we are inclined to think that even if the Ballot could do everything which it professes, it is doubtful if the balance of protection against abuses at elections be not all on the side of open voting.

But, farther, as to procedure at elections. Is everything to be secret under secret voting? We suppose it must be so. For what will it profit that a man drops his unseen ball on the right or the left, in the dark, if he go to the poll roaring out to the bystanders what he means to do? If the candidate is at-

tended to the hustings by all his committee-men, their votes can be matter of no mystery whatever. If John Smith, not of consequence enough to be invited to the hustings, cheers loudly in the crowd, and holds up both his hard, dirty, honest hands, what need has he of a ballot-box? If, at a preliminary meeting at the Barley Mow, Snug the joiner moves, and Flute the bellows-mender seconds, the motion that Pyramus is a fit and proper person to represent their borough, what use can they make of a ballot-box? If Brown, Jones, and Robinson have, since the writ was moved for, paraded the parish with the managing clerk of Quirk, Gammon, and Snap, what need have they of a ballot-box? The wrath of the Castle has been defied already. The custom of the Squire has been withdrawn. All the mischief has been done, and the sweet revenge of an open, hearty, fearless vote is all which the Ballot can prevent.

Now, is all this to cease? Shall we have no more crowds, or hustings, or Saturnalia? No more committees, resolutions, canvassing, speeches, or cheers? Is every one to conceal his sentiments as well as his vote, or are we to speak one way and vote another?

The answer to this question we need not stop to give. Vote openly or vote secretly, the men of this free country will continue to discuss politics in their old way, and no notion of violating the secrecy of the Ballot will ever prevent them from doing so. Does any one suppose that Mr. Bright would refuse to open his lips at Manchester because he might thereby betray how he was likely to vote? Would he have his audience refrain from those cheers which frequently greet him, because they may indicate the probable tendency of their suffrages? If we remember right, the Corn-law League at one time pledged the members of it to support no candidate who was not in favour of immediate and total abolition, and thereby disclosed how all those members were to vote; and they best know whether that popular movement would have been more powerful or less so if they had refrained from popular combination in order that their votes might be absolutely secret.

Here we approach very important and crucial considerations. We find an element, in the very heart of the electoral system, which is plainly at war with secrecy. Public discussion and party combination are utterly incompatible with the isolation without which the Ballot is of no use. No one can combine with a man who will not speak to him, and makes his intentions a mystery; and unless the vote given by Ballot is a mystery, the Ballot is an imposture. In order to make the Ballot a reality, the law must make it a misdemeanour to destroy the

mystery which protects the conscience of the elector. How, under secret voting, are we to deal with this anomaly?

Had we been brought up in the school of the original Ballotists we should have had no difficulty whatever in dealing with it. We should have disposed of it by a series of imperfect syllogisms, which would have brought the question to the clearest issue possible. For instance,

1. The secrecy of the vote is essential to the honesty of the voter.

 But political discussion, and combination have a tendency to prevent the secrecy of the vote.

 Therefore political discussion and combination have a tendency to prevent the honesty of the voter.

2. Everything which tends to prevent the honesty of the voter should be prohibited.

 But discussion and combination tend to prevent the honesty of the voter.

 Therefore discussion and combination should be prohibited.

3. No one who wishes voting to be honest will encourage that which tends to prevent voting being honest.

 But discussion and combination have such a tendency.

 Therefore, no one who wishes voting to be honest will encourage discussion and combination.

These, we think, are propositions fairly constructed on the model of the schools, and arrive at results quite as satisfactory as usual. They bring us to this solution of our dilemma, that all discussion and combination at elections should be put down by Act of Parliament, and that every one who demurs is a friend of corruption, instigated by his own inbred love of bribery, intimidation, and undue influence.

No doubt, the friends for whose benefit we write will tell us there is a fallacy involved in our propositions. So there is—a most palpable fallacy. They will also tell us that the people of this country will discuss and combine in spite of all the syllogisms which ever were or can be constructed, and in this also we agree with them. But perhaps these two rejoinders lead a little farther than at first sight appears.

If the only matter we had to accomplish were to give the voter such protection to his honesty as secrecy can bestow on it—if that were an object to be attained at all hazards—our syllogisms are perfect. The fallacy involved in them is that there are considerations more important than rendering a voter inaccessible to bribery and influence—that we may buy that result too dearly—and would certainly buy it too dearly, at

the cost of the conclusions at which our syllogisms arrive. But if that be so, has not all the reasoning on the Ballot hitherto been confined within limits which exclude the light — limits far too narrow to admit of truth emerging from them? Is it not clear that there are principles involved in secret voting—in real secret voting, which are more fundamental and more important than the mere question of corruption and intimidation? and that there is something more than a philosopher's speculation in Montesquieu's remark, that when the people have votes they should be given in public, and that this should be a fundamental law of democracy?

It appears accordingly that there is a principle, fundamental in popular government, which is antagonistic to the principle of secret voting; and that the operation of that antagonism will diminish, on the one hand, one great security for honest voting, and on the other, even if it did not affect voting at all, will weaken the elements from which popular power is derived. We shall say a word or two on these results.

It is a very great mistake to suppose that popular election is merely the aggregate of isolated votes. Indeed it would not be difficult to show that such a system of election would very soon cease to be popular at all. But all the usual arguments for secret voting leave out of view, how much honesty is produced and continued, by the non-isolation of votes. Let us take it, again, by a popular example. Brown, Jones, and Robinson, the committeemen we have referred to, are canvassers for a Liberal candidate. They are the best men in their borough—respected and looked up to by the tradesmen or villagers in their neighbourhood. Brown has his own friends, and so has Jones and Robinson, and these they meet, night after night, and discuss with them the principles of government, the acts of the Conservatives, the past struggles of Reform, and the Corn Laws, with that enthusiasm which, although sometimes uninformed, is after all the very foundation on which all popular government is built. The same spirit animates them all. Each looks to each as a fellow soldier in the same battle. They would scorn to flinch or fly, and a few words of approbation from Jones, or an eloquent appeal from Robinson, send them home proud of their country and themselves. Some of them perhaps have an adverse interest in the result. Some must be weak, selfish, or vacillating. But the finger of scorn which would meet them from their comrades, and the awful denunciation of the committeemen, retain even such men firm in their allegiance to principles which their reason ratifies, but which their interest prompts them to resist. It is very well for enlightened men, or

those who think themselves so, to sneer at village politicians. But these are the sinews of our representative system. If these be not realities — if the fervour and feelings of the mass of the electors were not such as these, we should be, and we should deserve to be, enslaved. The same effect of popular opinion which is so potent in ordinary morals, is the gravitating element which preserves, among the great bulk of these constituencies, the manly and honest convictions which are represented in the House of Commons.

Now what does the Ballot propose to do? It throws the voter loose, and it is its object to throw him loose, from all this efficacious and salutary control. A philosopher and philanthropist, wishing to raise a community to a higher state of moral feeling, would scarcely propose, as his first step, to make each individual independent of opinion — not independent merely of public, but independent of private opinion, and of any opinion—to leave him, in short, to his own guidance entirely, in the belief that this alone is necessary to guide him aright. Was ever man guided aright under such circumstances? Even if the baser motives which hard cash suggests were effectually excluded, influences enough are left in the man's own heart to delude and betray him. The shoemaker at the corner thinks that the grocer three doors off has a stronger hold on the candidate than he has, for a Custom House nomination. Jealousy whispers that it were better that the enemy should triumph, than that he should endure the mortification of a friend's success. The candidate remained longer with two or three other voters when he called, than he did with the energetic and didactic tailor, who takes such a lead in the third ward. The tailor drops his ball into the wrong box, and takes a quiet, unsuspected, and pleasant revenge. After all, says an aspiring attorney to himself, although I am a member of the Liberal party, I think Lord Rattletrap might give me his business, were he once in Parliament, and Mr. Dunstable employs Johnson over the way. The doctor's wife longs to go to London, and the Conservative candidate is her cousin. The doctor's principles, learned in the severest school of the Whigs, would have been steel to her entreaties — but — the vote is by Ballot, and nobody will know. Let any one experienced in electioneering matters only try to analyse and appreciate in detail the motives which he has found regulating individual electors, and say if our suggestions are in the least fanciful. Of such things,—slight, trivial, and contemptible as they are,—is human life made up. There is, with them all, one healthful spirit which wars against them. Not sublime contemplation, not self-meditation, not lofty philosophy, but the

honest glow of a friendly face. How many things does a man not do, for fear of the change which would come over Tom, Dick, or Harry, whose companionship makes up the ordinary staple of his life. Public opinion is a stilted word, but it only means what your friends think of you.

But the election is over. The Committee meet again to make up their accounts, and talk over their defeat. Of course the shoemaker and the tailor, the attorney and the doctor, are all there—it would excite suspicion were they not. The result is inexplicable. They look gloomily at each other, but who the traitors are, the Ballot forbids them to inquire. A year goes over their heads. The attorney has Lord Rattletrap's business. The doctor's lady has a ticket for the House of Lords; and when another election comes round, the enthusiasm of the Liberals has changed to distrust and weariness, and the Conservative interest reaps an easy and a permanent victory.

How plain then is it, that open voting, as well as open speaking and open canvassing, are of themselves great promoters of political honesty, and that secret voting removes one of our best and surest safeguards of public morality. But we think we are entitled to go farther than this. Not only does open discussion amd publicity tend to keep the great majority honest, but it is the only thing which can do so. It is the essence of all popular government, the root and foundation of all public spirit. We deny that any man, or any body of men, can persevere in a course of honest discharge of a public duty, if nobody knows how it is discharged. One of two results is certain to follow. Either, deprived of all check of public opinion, the voter will succumb before the first strong impulse of interest, or passion, or chagrin, or else, looking round in vain for the sunshine of sympathy, and uncheered by community of action with those he is accustomed to live among, he will find indifference throwing its cold grey mantle over the political struggles which used to be so exciting, and as no one will know how he gives his vote, he will cease to care for it himself.

The last result is the most fatal of all. It is political death. Dishonesty is only disease, and may be cured; but no spell will ever reanimate the public spirit of a people sunk in political indifference. The real stronghold of British liberty does not consist in the outward machinery of government. All that framework might be set up, every joint and rivet carefully copied, in any other region of the earth. But it is the animating spirit which makes it conducive to liberty and happiness. As long as the game of politics is the greatest which can be played; as long as the rich and independent, and high-born, men of

the ablest intellects, the rarest gifts, the most imposing position, find their highest occupation in unrewarded public exertion, investing to their country's service the hours of rest and leisure, gladly devoting, in that great workshop, their powers of mind and body to toil more severe than that undertaken by many a man who works for his bread, with no other prize glittering in the background than distinction in the eyes of the people, so long will this free island of ours remain that great seamark which she is, amid the billows of despotic power that roll on Europe. Such is the power of social sympathy.

The example of America is tediously reiterated, and the prosperity of that free and enlightened country is deduced from the practice of secret voting which there prevails. Young Australia also proposes to teach her ancient parent the elements of popular government. But our first answer to these analogies is that the example of Great Britain is worth them all. Our experience of open voting is far longer, and has stood the test of time and storms; while the ultimate effect of secret voting in America or Australia will be known only when these constitutions have outlived a couple of centuries. But the truth is, the examples are worth nothing, excepting to add to the accumulated proofs that the Ballot has never been known to produce the results promised by its apostles. It is quite true that from America came the idea of that Ballot which Bentham and the Westminster Reviewers hailed as an inspiration in 1828, and it is also true that the passing of the Reform Bill in 1832, and the flagrant instances of intimidation which occurred during the first election, gave vigour to the theory which they had recently imported. But it was adopted in utter ignorance of its real results. Every one knows now that bribery and intimidation flourish in peculiar luxuriance under the American Ballot. In a speech delivered by Mr. Cobden last summer, he referred to the City of Philadelphia, and stated, as an example of the operation of secret voting, that a bribe was never known to be given in that pattern and Puritan city. We thought at the time that Mr. Cobden could have found examples at home of the same phenomenon under open voting. We never heard of bribes being given in Edinburgh or Glasgow. But the speech had a singular sequel. It had caught the eye of Judge Dana, of Massachusetts, who, finding to his astonishment such applause bestowed on American purity, wrote to the 'Times' to say that they had discarded the Ballot in Massachusetts on account of the intolerable corruption which prevailed under it. Mr. Cobden answered that, at all events, it led to much greater order and quiet in the American elections, as compared with the turbulence

of those in England. 'Quiet and order!' exclaimed an American editor: 'Mr. Cobden is no doubt an able man, but he can never 'have seen an election in New York.' In short, nothing is to be gained in aid of the Ballot from American experience; and until America herself is clear on the result of the experiment, we may not unreasonably request to be relieved of the oppression of so questionable a precedent.

As to Australia, the rude beginnings of a constitution at the antipodes would be a forlorn refuge indeed for arguments that have been driven out of Europe and America. But the Australian doctors differ. Mr. Childers says the secret system is successful. Mr. Marsh says exactly the reverse. And as there has been no experience worth quoting, on one side or other, we may discard the Australian element altogether.

But there is one remark to be made as regards both America and Australia. We possess what no mere institutions can confer, — a high and healthy political opinion. Open voting is far more valuable to us than it can be in a new country. We live, and thrive, and prosper on our old traditions. They preserve the integrity of our statesmen; they give our best and noblest lives to the unpaid service of their country; they kindle the flame of political enthusiasm; they breathe the breath of life through the joints and sinews of the Constitution, and impress on it a nobility beyond the reach of theory or imitation. America and Australia have them not; and therefore can be no models for us.

Take again the example of France, where the Ballot was first introduced to protect the members of the Legislative Assemblies from the violence of the mob, but where it has since played no inconsiderable part in the subversion of constitutional government and the establishment of despotic power. Under the monarchy and the charter the electoral franchise was doubtless too restricted, but the power and influence of the electoral body was still further diminished by the fact that, voting by Ballot, the opinion of the elector was, or might be, concealed from the mass of his fellow citizens; thus the Chamber of Deputies ceased to represent the nation because the elements in which it took its origin were secret and unknown. Since the revolution of 1848, the Ballot, allied to universal suffrage, has been employed with perfect success in the jugglery of elections to produce the results which suited the ruling powers of the day, and its mechanism is now so well understood that by an ingenious perversion of its original design it lends itself to every fresh encroachment of absolute power, and instead of being a check on the government it serves as one of the most convenient

instruments of authority. We have now before us a pamphlet entitled the 'Protestation of M. Le Beschu de Champsavin,' against the intrigues of the government at an election in the department of Ille-et-Vilaine, where this gentleman, a highly-respected member of the imperial court of Rennes, was defeated last year by a 'sous-chef du cabinet de l'Empereur.' Indeed, it is notorious at the present time in France, that no man who is not a nominee of the government can be returned. Every form of wholesale corruption, influences, promises, intimidation, and punishment for the crime of independent voting, is employed with complete impunity; and the Ballot, far from preventing or diminishing the evil, throws a convenient screen over these practices and renders it impossible to expose them as they deserve.*

We say, therefore, that in this as in other countries the effect of secret voting would be a tendency to diminish the honesty of our electors, by removing what is at once a check and an incentive, and it would tend also to weaken the public spirit of the constituencies, by withdrawing the element of sympathy and popular applause, by which public spirit is cheered, animated, and maintained. We say its tendency would be in that direction, and that its inherent principles point that way. That it would destroy public honesty or public spirit we do not believe, because we are satisfied that it would produce but a small part of the effects which its friends anticipate. It would very soon degenerate into a clumsier and more inconvenient kind of open voting, and for all practical purposes every man's vote would be as well known as at present. That is a kind of secret which no man in this free country can keep; but exactly in proportion as the elements of secrecy may be introduced will the tendencies we have mentioned prevail.

* Thus, a distribution of public money was made under different pretences to the poorer communes; the government candidate promised to obtain funds for the completion of a church; 15,000 francs were promised to assist a commune in making a road, *if the commune voted right;* a portion of the department was turned into an Imperial domain; tickets bearing exclusively the name of the government candidate were issued to the electors, all others were forbidden; a letter-carrier who had dared to circulate tickets for the opposition candidate was instantly cashiered as 'an enemy of the Emperor and 'a dangerous character;' and every man suspected of an adverse vote was threatened and persecuted. The Ballot was absolutely powerless to protect the electors from the influence or resentment of the agents of the government. All this occurred at the election above referred to.

But, to conclude, secret voting seems to us to involve a denial of the first principles of popular liberty. Individual isolation is the principle of arbitrary and despotic government, as it is of the Ballot. The combination of individuals is the principle of popular power, and of the British Constitution. In proportion as they combine, they are free, because they are powerful. In proportion as they are isolated they are oppressed, because they are weak. The perfection of the Ballot would be complete isolation, and therefore a complete destruction of our liberties. It only falls short of this result to the extent to which it fails of carrying out the element involved in it; but that element is not less surely present or operative in it. If we had, what we shall never have again, a monarch who wished to subvert our freedom, or a Parliament unfaithful to its trust, the surest step which either could take in that direction would be to impose as a chain what so many demand as a privilege, -- to prohibit the right of open voting, and compel every elector to register his suffrage in secrecy and darkness. That object once accomplished, the suppression of political combinations would easily follow, and that secrecy against which the whole of our democratic system revolts, but which our democrats so insanely demand, would, when enforced by the hand of compulsion, perform its appropriate function in destroying the rights of the people.

Are we, then, to submit in patience to electoral corruption, and leave our constituencies to be bought and sold as they please? We are far from saying so; but the evil is a moral one, and the cure must be so also. Public opinion is the only specific we know of for the cure of delinquencies which defy the law. Public opinion has rendered our judges incorruptible, and the growing moral sense of the country has, since the days of Walpole, obliterated even the recollection of parliamentary corruption. Now and then, the glitter of a social distinction, or the more solid rewards which a Minister has sometimes in his gift, may be suspected of giving a bias to an individual vote in Parliament; but these cases are now rare, and seldom go without retribution. We must therefore look for the destruction of electoral corruption to the same potent influence, which, stronger than written law, and more powerful than abstract morality, has eliminated duelling from our code of honour, and banished intemperance from our tables.

This element must take its root first in those who control and lead public opinion. When public men are really in earnest in this matter, the remedial principle will begin to operate, and not till then. It is in vain to commence at the lower end of the scale. As long as there is a purchaser there

will be a market, and as long as there is no social disgrace in offering a bribe, there will be none attached to the acceptance of one. The first test of sincerity will be found in just and honest legislation on the subject of corruption. Bribery is an offence of a very ordinary but of an unquestionably criminal character. A man who pays money to induce a vote, is exactly in the same moral position, and is an offender of the very same class, as the man who pays money to suborn evidence, or to induce any other illegal act. Let it be punished in the same way and proved in the same manner. Let a jury judge of the fact, and let the offender, high or low, have his hair cut and take his turn at the crank. One or two examples would be quite sufficient, for it would soon become unfashionable and unprofitable to run such risks for the 'whistling of a name.' Nor need the vain fear of parting with their privileges alarm the Commons at this suggestion. The trial and punishment of the offender need have no more effect on the seat, unless the Commons so will it, than the trial of a prize-fighter for an assault, or of a swell-mobsman for picking a pocket, at an election. But the real stamp of crime — so different from that fraudulent trade-mark it bears at present — once affixed to bribery, and the punishment once extended, as in all other crimes, to accessories as well as to principals, the act would take its proper grade in the moral scale, and we should abolish by the hand of social ostracism what laws and parliaments have striven in vain to prevent.

In like manner, intimidation and undue influence can only be effectually prevented by a higher moral tone among landlords, and more thorough independence among tenants. Nor are there wanting symptoms of a more healthy feeling in this respect. The hateful and contemptible system of exclusive dealing, so generally practised immediately after the Reform Bill, has almost entirely disappeared; and the proprietor who generally puts the strongest screw on his tenants, is usually a parvenu, unaccustomed to the rights and usages of his position. The honourable responsibility of rank and property inspires a higher and more generous feeling; and the day, we believe, is not distant when a gentleman will scorn to have it known that he coerced or intimidated a tenant in the exercise of his political rights.

But, when all is said, it is possible to overrate the evil, not of the principle or element, but of the influence of electoral corruption. There can be no question that exactly in proportion to the value attached to the position of a member of the Legislature, barren as it is for the most part of every return but honour, will be the tendency to obtain it by sinister means.

The desire for that distinction is the foundation of our liberties, and as long as it remains and flourishes, our free Constitution will retain its preeminence; and the efforts of patriotism should be directed to produce and foster such a healthy state of public morality as shall render the growth of these pernicious plants as rare and as slow as possible.

While these remarks are passing through the press, another failure has overtaken the last attempt at Parliamentary Reform; defeated by the great enemy, time, and obstructed by many open foes and some unwilling friends, the proposal of the Government has been withdrawn. The result has surprised no one who has been accustomed to read the signs of popular opinion on such questions. The state of public feeling on such organic changes is always 'a quiet ebb or a tempestuous flow.' The surges of the storm which carried the Reform Bill and swept over the benches of the Upper House, for some years afterwards were productive of grumblings against finality, and demands for extended electoral rights. But these were only on the surface. The real effect was that which, in a country so little impulsive as ours, was sure to follow: repose, and to a certain extent reaction. Bold and uncompromising until the result was gained, the public, exhausted by the excitement and satisfied with the victory, subsided into political contentment; and many of those whom the current carried headlong, looked back not without a shudder to the dangers along which they had passed. This would have been so even had the harvest of improved administration been less brilliant than it has been. But what the effects of reaction began, prosperity such as we never enjoyed before has completed; and for many years it has been probable that Reform in Parliament will never again, in our day at least, be worth anything as a stock in trade to a demagogue, or the subject of political convulsions, unless we are destined to more evil days than any signs now on the horizon would lead us to prognosticate.

Nothing, in our judgment, can be more untrue than the distorted retrospect and the gloomy predictions published by Sir John Walsh under the specious title of 'The Practical Results of 'the Reform Act of 1832.' He must have a most imperfect conception of the state of England before that measure, who does not see that a great and dangerous crisis had long been gathering in the nation, to which the Reform Bill of 1832 applied an appropriate and effectual remedy. He too must have a most imperfect conception of the services rendered by that Act to the country, who does not perceive that in substance the main grievances and abuses of which the people justly com-

plained, were then removed; and that the same vehement agitation and the same strong measures cannot now be reproduced, simply because the provocation is wanting. Reform in our days is not regarded as the indispensable remedy for intolerable evils; but as the gradual result and natural development of increasing intelligence, education, and property.

On these public and national grounds, entirely apart from the stability or downfall of any given administration, there might have been great wisdom and public benefit in a revision and extension of the electoral basis at the present time. The progress of the excluded ranks in all the arts and virtues which intellectual culture fosters, points out, as a mere matter of conviction, that the line drawn in 1832 admits of beneficial relaxation. If it be thought that the working classes are too much segregated from the upper ranks, and cherish within their own body political and social opinions dangerous to the State, this to our mind would furnish the strongest reason in favour of an adjustment of the franchise, which should bring their leaders into more direct contact with those above them, and bind them together in the interest and relations which the exercise of a common privilege would inspire. To do so would in our opinion be safe: we think it would also be wise. For the working classes, as they increase—and they have wonderfully increased—in intelligence and respectability, are becoming every day a more influential power in our social system. This power must find its development in some direction, and the most elementary political wisdom would suggest that it had better by degrees be allowed to flow through constitutional channels, than be pent up behind obstinate barriers of exclusion until it sweep them away.

Lord John Russell, we think, deserves great credit for his clear discernment of this truth, and his persevering efforts to give it practical effect. But he has, perhaps, miscalculated the practical difficulties in his way, and these have indeed increased at every step which seemed to lead nearer the desired result. How is a minister, with no popular demand behind him, to persuade a House of Commons that it would be dignified and patriotic for it to make its own quietus? How convince the representatives of thirty or forty boroughs that they are, in their own persons, unseemly excrescences on the body politic, withered branches on the tree of freedom, which ought, without delay, to be ignominiously removed? If, indeed, they were to go to self-sacrifice amid the applause of a multitude, crowned with garlands, and to mount the funeral pyre surrounded by shouts of encouragement, such virtue might be found among

them. But the Reform Bill offered them nothing but a rope, a convenient bough, and an obscure corner; and no one can be at all surprised that, with many professions of readiness to die for their country, the offer was tacitly but resolutely declined.

Again, the present tendencies of the working classes have reared up a great additional difficulty in the way of their admission to the franchise. Fresh from a contest with the trades' unions, ruinous alike to masters and to men, is it wonderful that the employers of labour have become not so very clear that political power would be safe in hands which seem to them to have too much power already? A cheerful and hearty pressure from without in favour of more generous views, might probably have compelled them to throw aside and forget their personal exigencies. But amid the peaceful repose of all, it was only natural that the prevalent feeling on their minds should have received both expression and effect.

And then it was necessary to encounter and overcome the great obstructive body on the Conservative benches, bound as they now are to no policy, — to no following true, — but trimming their sails to catch some coming breeze from every point of the compass by turns. In 1858 they did not wait for popular excitement to be convinced of the necessity of Reform. The necessity, in their opinion, was urgent and imminent. It was their province to show, in the eyes of Mr. Bright and the country, that they were the real Liberals; and if the member for Birmingham was for the time blinded, we can hardly wonder at his belief that the shouts which attended his parliamentary displays in their favour, from the Conservative rank and file, during the session of 1858, represented metal more solid than that for which his constituency is proverbial. But nature, violently expelled, has once more asserted her sway over the Tory mind. Mr. Bright, their pride and hope in 1858, has been the sole object of their affected fear in 1860. He has changed none of his views, excepting in the direction of moderation, since he appeared to them as an angel of light to deliver them from the impending crash of the Cardwell resolution. But, rudely awakened from their transitory dream, all things are now changed in their eyes, and they look on Mr. Bright and Reform with something of the feelings with which Titania regarded the recollection of her flirtation with Bottom and the ass's head.

> 'How came those things to pass?
> Oh! how mine eyes do loathe that image now!'

Reform, the overwhelming necessity of which cost them their

places, is now seen by Conservative eyes to be a matter about which nobody cares, and which will do nobody any good. The working classes, whom they were to have enfranchised by hundreds of thousands, they now find to be utterly untrustworthy, by reason of their obstinate resistance to free trade in labour. The same men who cheered Mr. Lindsay when he avowed that he supported Lord Derby's government because he expected that minister to promote the principles which he and Mr. Bright maintained, now hold everything that comes out of Manchester in such holy abhorrence, that a bill even touched by one of the profane sect is defiled in their eyes. We do not quarrel with this. It is the truth of their opinions. Nor do we wish to dwell on the feelings with which the party must look back to the hypocrisies and humiliations of their fifteen months of office.

In such lip-service to every sentiment but the real one have five months of this Session passed. The time has not been profitably spent, and yet the result has not been without its lessons.

First, we may learn how small a crop of political discontent is to be reaped in this island, even by the most industrious husbandry. The people are prosperous and satisfied, even to a degree which is impassive. The working classes have been tried with republicanism, Americanism, and even with socialism, but they will have none of any of these prescriptions. They love the monarchy, they take pride in the aristocracy, they would rather trade with America than fight with her, but they would rather fight than imitate her. While statesmen have been haranguing on Parliamentary Reform, the people have been evoking once more the martial ardour which years of peace had cast aside, and peer and artisan alike have been buckling on the arms, which too flattering prophets had believed to have been beaten into ploughshares long ago. It is to be hoped that the clouds which now loom over Europe may pass away, and that those brilliant bands, of the best blood of our country, who have so earnestly answered to the first note of danger, may by their very promptitude have created the security they have shown themselves so ready to maintain. Meanwhile, those who are so well prepared to defend their institutions, are not in the least inclined to overturn them; and while the genuine spirit of Liberal opinions is perhaps stronger and more widely diffused than ever, there never was a time when subversion was so little likely to take the place of Reform.

A second lesson which we may learn from the fate of the Reform Bill, is, how hopeless it is to regulate beforehand the

subjects which shall interest the public, or to dictate to them the topics on which they shall become excited. The admission of three or four hundred thousand of our countrymen to an important political privilege is, at first sight, as hopeful a theme for enthusiasm, and as solid as well as generous a proposition, as ever made the fortune of an agitator or a minister. But the waters refuse to be stirred by the spell that was once so powerful; and, however wise and salutary such a measure may be, it seems probable that neither piecemeal nor in its integrity, neither wholesale nor by retail, will any measure of Reform pass the Houses of Parliament, unless in circumstances of public feeling greatly altered from those which now prevail.

Our own opinion is that it will not be prudent to embark the credit of an Administration in another Reform Bill, without a much clearer demonstration of its chances of success than any which attended the Bill which has just expired; for although such attempts do surely, in the end, bring round the right result, ultimate success may be purchased too dearly by disparaging the position of a minister and diminishing the respect due to the deliberations of Parliament. If the attempt is to be renewed, it must be on narrower ground. The tone of Parliament and of the country will not sustain Parliamentary Reform on the level of a first-class question; and it is but beating the air to fill the leaden ear of the constituencies with the high-sounding phrases of 1831. By judicious and gradual legislation, by dealing with the question as one of administrative adjustment instead of one of organic change, it is possible that much good might be effected; and this course would go far to allay the uncontrollable panic which seizes all members on the announcement of another great measure of Parliamentary Reform. A revision of the system for the registration of votes; the appropriation of the four seats now vacant; the disfranchisement of some other boroughs convicted of gross corruption, which would place other seats at the disposal of the Legislature; and some other practical measures of a similar character, are perfectly attainable objects. And we are inclined to think that more would really be gained by gradual, though partial, improvements in the working of our Parliamentary constitution, than by abortive attempts to carry sweeping measures which threaten to alter the balance of social power, and which lay claim to a character of finality they can never really possess. It is not for us to bind futurity, but to perform the work which the present time calls upon us to do.

The fate of the schemes of Parliamentary Reform propounded in the last and in the present Session, remind us that we have lived

more than a quarter of a century since their great predecessor was carried. New men and new things, new thoughts and fashions, new tendencies and tempers, railroads and electric telegraphs, free trade and Whitworth cannon, and many an opinion and many an invention besides, have spread their influence over that eventful interval. The Reform Bill of 1832, in its results, is a living triumph; but the atmosphere in which it was carried to victory has been swept away for ever. The resounding periods which spoke its praises, and which went with such electric power to enthusiastic crowds in that excited time, raise the pulse and stir the blood no longer. The entrancing rapture of our boyhood is not to be recalled; the words and scenes are the same, but the sympathies, the associations, the yearnings they appeal to, are all changed. It is as well as it is. We have other duties—some sterner, some more practical—besides and beyond the question who are to vote for members of Parliament in a country in which the franchise, as well as every other social and political distinction, may be acquired by every man who will devote his industry and intelligence to the acquisition of political rights. It was fortunate that we set our Commons House in order when we did; the time seems shortly coming when we shall be engaged in more active and world-wide contention, and our best energies should be spent in making sure that we be ready to play our part when that hour arrives.

No. CCXXVIII. will be published in October.

052 EDI
VOL. 112 (PT. 1 & 2)
Johnstone Public Library
Date 23.7.7
Accn. No. 7,544

THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1860.

No. CCXXVIII.

ART. I.—1. *Transactions of the Royal Geographical Society for* 1857, 1858, 1859.

2. *Oriental and Western Siberia: A Narrative of Seven Years' Explorations and Adventures in Siberia, Mongolia, the Kirghis Steppes, Chinese Tartary, and Part of Central Asia.* By THOMAS WITLAM ATKINSON. London: 1858.

3. *Travels in the Regions of the Upper and Lower Amoor and the Russian Acquisitions on the Confines of India and China.* By T. W. ATKINSON. London: 1860.

4. *The Lake Regions of Central Africa. A Picture of Exploration.* By RICHARD F. BURTON, Fellow and Gold Medallist of the R. G. Society. 2 vols. London: 1860.

5. *Travels, Researches, and Missionary Labours during an Eighteen Years' Residence in Eastern Africa.* By the Rev. Dr. J. LEWIS KRAPF. With an Appendix by E. G. RAVENSTEIN, F.R.G.S. London: 1860.

6. *Travels and Scientific Explorations in Central Africa, during the years* 1853 *to* 1857. By Dr. EDWARD VOGEL, M.R.A.R.G.S.L., &c. &c. *With a brief Memoir of his Life to his reputed Death by order of the Sultan of Wadai; and a Sketch of the Geography of Central Africa.* By E. G. RAVENSTEIN, M.R.G.S.

7. *The Sources of the Nile: being a General Survey of the Basin of that River and of its Head Streams, with the History of Nilotic Discovery.* By CHARLES T. BEKE. London: 1860.

8. *The Colony of Natal.* By ROBERT JAMES MANN, M.D., Superintendent of Education in Natal. London: 1860.
9. *Seven Years' Residence in the Great Deserts of North America.* By the Abbé EM. DOMENECH. 2 vols. London: 1860.
10. *Narrative of an Expedition Through the Southern Portion of Rupert's Land, from Lake Superior to near the foot of the Rocky Mountains, including the Region traversed by the Overland Route from Canada to British Columbia; with a Description of the Physical Geography, Geology, and Climate of the Country.* By HENRY YOULE HIND, M.A., Professor of Chemistry and Geology in Trinity College, Toronto; in Charge of the Canadian Assiniboine and Saskatchewan Exploring Expedition. With Maps of the country explored, Geographical and Geological; and numerous Illustrations of Scenery, &c. London: 1860.

THE Royal Geographical Society, though comparatively of recent date, has already taken high rank among the scientific institutions of this country, and well merits that place by the energy and success with which it has pursued the objects contemplated in its original design. Every year has enlarged the sphere of action of this Society, and given it closer connexion with those various enterprises of research which, whether aided by Government or not, are the offspring of English spirit and character; and belong fitly to a people filling all land and sea with their commerce, and holding possessions in every part of the globe. The Geographical Society has recently done much to direct and methodise, as well as to encourage, these researches. In pointing out the objects to be fulfilled, it expedites their attainment; and by giving earlier and wider publicity to the results, adds a powerful incentive to the ardour of discovery. While tracing the rivers, and traversing the deserts, of Central Africa; wintering amidst polar ice; or seeking ingress to the unknown interior of Australia, the traveller feels that all he does is reported and watched over with interest in England: and that touching word of *home*—almost peculiar in this sense to the English vocabulary—is more continually present to his thought, the end and the reward of the labours he has undergone.

The later volumes of the Transactions of the Society, admirably edited by Dr. Norton Shaw, attest all we have said in its commendation. They show further the growing connexion of geography with other branches of physical knowledge, and very especially with geology;—sister sciences they may well be called, from the many relations linking them together. Several of our most eminent naturalists have a common

interest in the Geographical and Geological Societies, and have discharged with equal zeal the offices of both. One duty in common has been the delivery by the President of an Annual Address, relating at large the progress of the science during the year. These discourses form a very valuable part of the volumes of the Geographical Society now before us. The summary of what has been done tells more distinctly what there is yet to do, and gives guidance and incentive to it. Such collections of facts, moreover, furnished by different observers, and drawn from every part of the earth, bring us nearer to those general conclusions, the object and end of all science. It is the better definition of this object which forms the characteristic of modern research, and contributes so greatly to its success.

Following in the train of these Annual Addresses, and, where needful, availing ourselves of them, we shall seek in the following pages to put before our readers the actual state of geographical knowledge; under a certain limitation, however, rendered necessary, as we shall speedily see, from the vast range now given to this field of research by those who have laboured in it with highest zeal and success. And here we must pause for a moment, reminded by this very expression that we have lost within the last year two men who stood foremost among the number of scientific geographers. Baron Humboldt may almost be called the father of Physical Geography, since to his personal researches and various writings it is mainly indebted for the place it now holds among the sciences. The career of Carl Ritter was of a more recluse kind, and less lofty in its scope. But his great work on Geography will ever remain a monument of persevering and successful toil; distinguished above all things by a critical exactness as to facts, which makes it a model for every similar undertaking. Germany may well be proud of having produced contemporaneously two such labourers in this great domain of human knowledge.

It is Mr. Burke who speaks of Geography as 'an earthly 'subject, but a heavenly study.' If this description was justifiable then, much more is it so now, when our knowledge of the earth we inhabit has been enlarged, not solely by penetration into new lands and seas, but yet more by that close alliance with physical science in all its branches, of which we have just spoken; and which, while recording new relations of animate and inanimate nature on our own globe, denotes at the same time the many connexions of terrestrial objects and phenomena with those belonging to the other worlds of planetary space. Physical geography, in its present aspect, is less a science in itself than a group of sciences blended by mutual services.

It is the same correlation, and an admirable example of it, which is now giving a new form to the physical sciences in their every part — the foundation already of great discoveries, and the foreshadow of still greater to come.

Yet with all these attainments of modern geography, it is curious to note the prevailing want of a clear conception of the very phenomena on which this knowledge rests. How few of the many hundred millions who tenant the earth carry their comprehension beyond the physical conditions immediately surrounding them! How few, even of those better instructed, can truly conceive of the great globe on which they live,—loose, as it were, in space, and at every instant changing its place in the heavens; yet bound and tied by gravitation to the greater globe of the sun; — revolving every twenty-four hours on its own axis; — moving in its annual orbit with a rapidity above a thousand times greater than the speed ever attained by a railroad express; and, beyond all this, partaking in that mighty movement of the whole solar system, to which the astronomer sees no present limit of time or distance, nor any explanation of the forces, certain and vast though they be, which maintain this mysterious secular change. Those even to whom such astronomical conditions are familiar as facts, have difficulty in bringing the mind to comprehend these complex motions in space, fulfilled by forces which we can define only in their effects, though proved to pervade the universe of worlds.

How few again, save amongst those who traverse the great oceans, practically conceive of the rotundity of the earth, and of that relative distribution of the parts of its surface, making our colonies of Australia and New Zealand the antipodes of the little island which has sent forth its swarms to people and civilise this southern hemisphere. How strange, moreover, to those unused to such considerations, the fact that three-fourths of the total surface of the globe is deep ocean; obeying in its tides the attractions of the sun and moon, but except in this transient deviation, ever preserving the exact spheroidal figure which belongs to the primitive consolidation of the planet.

Then further, as to the structure of the great globe the surface of which we inhabit, how vaguely do we regard the wonderful problems it offers to physical research. Natural causes of elevation, dislocation, or abrasion, together with the more partial results of mining and other human works, have disclosed to the geologist those remarkable successions of rocks — stratified or unstratified — recording anterior ages of life, or devoid of all tokens of it — which form the objects and the glory of his science. But this knowledge is superficial only, in the

simple physical sense of the word. The inclination of the strata enables us to estimate depths of these masses far beyond those of the deepest mines, but still bearing the ratio of a few miles only to the diameter of the globe. We have further attained, by different means, some approximate results as to the specific gravity of the whole earth. All this, however, tells us little of the nature of the enormous mass of matter thus aggregated in the bulk of our planet; nor discloses, except by inference, the form and conditions of its aggregation. Such inference we chiefly draw from those curious observations in mines and artesian wells, which mark a temperature progressively increasing downwards from a neutral line near the surface, where external and internal causes of temperature balance each other. Below this line the heat augments at the rate of 1° Faht. for every sixty-five feet; the uniformity of result in different localities sufficing to establish the fact; and the conclusion from it, that at certain depths, the mass of the globe must become a fluid material—some such, we may suppose, as that poured out from the smelting furnaces of our great iron fields. The explorer of living volcanos treads his way over a stream of fresh lava, upon the thin crust covering the molten matter which slowly flows underneath. We have our dwelling on a similar though denser crust; every where wrapping round that fiery central fluid, from which are derived the materials as well as the physical forces, producing earthquakes and volcanic eruptions; and the slower displacements by elevation or depression, which are ever changing in one part or other the outward face of the globe. The medium thickness of this crust, not known from certain data, has been variously estimated. It is another example of the wonderful relations between branches of physical science seemingly the most remote, that we should have a calculation by an eminent mathematician of the thickness required to satisfy the theory of the precession of the equinoxes; in which estimate Mr. Hopkins has further sought, by consideration of the relative conducting powers of crystallised and uncrystallised matter, to conciliate his result with the observed increment of heat in descending below the line of neutral temperature.

The establishment of such relations is the great gain, as it is the glory, of the science of our day. Their unexpectedness in many cases gives an air almost of romance to the solution we thus obtain of some of the most profound problems of the natural world. We might readily add numerous instances of like kind, in which the science of geography is closely concerned. Such relations occur chiefly within the wide circuit of physical

geography; as distinguished from that artificial division and nomenclature which man has imprinted on the surface of the globe; and which maps, in one form or other, technically express to us. Under the latter more limited sense, the term Geography was long applied; and even now the methods of geographical instruction are too exclusively moulded upon this conception. Its first and most heedful office, indeed, must ever be that of an index to the living history of mankind; — a relation including all ages, and every region of the earth, whether peopled by savage or civilised life. Man, while associated with other and innumerable forms of being around him, is supreme upon the globe. His history, though late in the succession of time, if we look to the fossil records of the rocks, is that which we everywhere find written on the actual surface of the earth. He alone of the animal creation penetrates by land or water into its every part, the frozen seas of the polar circle, and the torrid deserts under the equator; urged not solely by those instinctive necessities which he shares with inferior forms of animal life, but yet more by his intellectual faculties, and those passions and propensities, which are blended with and define his being.

But this human history itself, the especial object and office of geography, is closely bound in by the physical conditions, to which we have already adverted as associating our knowledge of the earth with all other natural sciences. Scarcely is there one of those conditions which has not some concern, direct or indirect, with the existence and well-being of man. His progress and diffusion over the globe; his dissevement into races and communities; his advance in civilisation and the arts and refinements of life, have all dependence more or less upon these physical causes. Without adopting all the deductions of Mr. Buckle, we may cite, as familiar instances to this effect, the various incidents of climate; — of plain or mountain region; — of fertility of soil; — of mines yielding metallic ores or fuel; of proximity to the sea; of facility of internal communication. These and other conditions may severally be modified or annulled for a time by others; but they never can be inoperative. In his animal existence, man has the same necessities to encounter, the same struggles to maintain, as other animals in the world around him. But he brings to this battle of life faculties and endowments which give him mastery over many of the physical conditions to which other animals inevitably yield. The very nature of the struggle to him is such as to exalt his powers of intellect and action, and to raise him above those mere instincts of animal life, in which he participates. He alone has

powers which enable him to govern and apply to use all the great forces of nature, even such as might seem too vast and violent to be submitted to human control.

While seeking thus to give the largest signification to the term of geography; and to inculcate the teaching it in connexion with the physical phenomena of the globe, as well as the history of man, we must here restrict ourselves chiefly to descriptive geography, as commonly thus understood; and to those records of discovery by land and sea which form the main subject of the volumes before us. And here we may first note the great advances made in all the methods by which these researches are carried on; the larger scope and more exact definition of inquiry; and the completeness of its fulfilment. Whether exploring countries untrodden before, or surveying those imperfectly laid down, the traveller now carries with him resources unknown to those of all earlier date. Though not perhaps especially furnished in any branch of physical science, his eye is more open to the general aspects of nature, and to those relations which pervade all parts of it. The admirable instruments which science now furnishes for familiar use, are further concerned in the change we are denoting. Even the mere summer tourists of the world have received more of the leaven of general knowledge, fitting them better to profit by what they see; and instances are frequent of those who, going forth without plan or purpose, have returned the discoverers of new regions, and imbued with zeal and ability for further enterprise. Our colonies, again, those prodigies of an empire spreading itself over the whole earth, have nurtured men ardent in discovery, and in the development of those natural resources, so largely reciprocating to the mother-country the prosperous existence she has given to her offspring. Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the Cape are examples in point. In India also, and especially on its northern confines, much has been done by public and private enterprise; fettered indeed in many respects, if facilitated in others, by those fluctuating conditions of war and sovereignty, which have marked the growth of our Indian empire, and still in some sort impend over its destinies.

In estimating our knowledge of the earth's surface, it is rarely considered how very recent the far greater part of this knowledge actually is. A period of less than four centuries includes the whole of that career of discovery, which began with the great exploits of Columbus, Vasco de Gama, and other navigators of the same stamp, and has since embraced the whole circumference of the globe. The ocean, navigated under

better knowledge of the figure of the earth, and with the magnet in the hands of the mariner, gave passage to the New World, and fresh approaches to continents before imperfectly known. The spirit of bold and romantic adventure, the appetite for distant and undefined dominion, religious zeal for the conversion of heathen tribes, the ardour of commerce, and the thirst for treasure less lawfully acquired, were all awakened at the same time, and concurred to the same result. True geography may be said to date from the end of the 15th century. Since that time its progress has been rapid and constant; stimulated not solely by the motives just mentioned, but also, and more honourably, by the pure love of that science of nature which holds the whole surface of the earth as part of its great domain.

We might here pause awhile, to compare and contrast our present knowledge of the globe, with those vague and limited conceptions, which formed the sole possession of even the most eminent geographers of antiquity. But this topic is probably familiar to most of our readers; and those who seek to study its details will find them recorded in the volume of Humboldt's Cosmos, with the vividness which belongs to all his writings. Limiting ourselves, then, to a brief notice of this subject, we may remark, that the globular form of the earth, distinctly propounded and illustrated by Aristotle, was familiar in idea to many of the ancient geographers; but for the most part wrongly applied to the actual delineation of the known lands or seas; and affording, of course, no just conception of the surface yet unknown. Two, especially, of the most remarkable of these old geographers, Eratosthenes and Ptolemy,—men who stood in advance of their times,—founded their delineation of the earth on the astronomical and geometrical data furnished by the knowledge of the age; the happiest application of which was that already made by Hipparchus, in marking the position of places by latitude and longitude, upon the same principle, though rudely applied, as that now in use. The great work of Strabo is more purely descriptive, but very valuable as such, as well as in its reference to other and earlier geographers. Pliny's Geography is but part of his Natural History, and must be regarded in the light of a mere compilation. The work of Pausanias, limited mainly to the geography of Greece, is an example of what may be done for historical and classical research by the exactness of personal observation.

Of the geographers just named, it will be seen that all but one were Greeks in race and language. Three of these, however, wrote as citizens of the vast empire of Rome, at a period when this wonderful sovereignty had reached its widest extent;

and under a succession of emperors — Trajan, Hadrian, and the Antonines—who held it for a long series of years in tranquil and prosperous subjection. Even at this time the Mediterranean formed the centre of all that could be called true geography. Conquest, colonisation, or commerce had made well known all the countries immediately bordering on this great inland sea; and more or less perfectly what lay beyond, within the boundary of the Roman rule. Some portion, indeed, of the southern coast of the Mediterranean, between Carthage and Alexandria, was even better known at that time than it is in our own day. But beyond the boundary of the empire, geography was little more than a vague picture of regions fading in the obscurity of distance; or known only by idle and superstitious tales, which the ignorance of the age credited, and its learning could not contradict. Towards the west, the Atlantic cut off all but an imperfect knowledge of the coasts of this ocean, and of the islands nearest to them. The commercial voyages of the Phœnician people — wonderful exploits under the modes of navigation then in use,—form a striking episode in ancient geography; yet withal so obscure, that even the labours of Heeren have failed to throw much light upon it. On the eastern side, a certain amount of knowledge was extended through Persia and India, even to the confines of China; but becoming more feeble at each successive step of distance. On the northern boundary it was yet more speedily lost in regions of forest, arid plains, or morass; and the vague notices of Scythia, Scandinavia, Sarmatia, &c., attest the scanty acquaintance with countries which could yield little to conquest, commerce, or colonisation.

From this mere outline of ancient geography, we come at once to that of our own day; passing over those intermediate steps of discovery, through which we have reached our present knowledge of the earth's surface. These discoveries are mainly, as we have said, the fruit of the last four centuries. From the decline of the Roman empire to this recent date, geographical knowledge, in common with all other sciences, either was stationary or actually receded within narrower limits than before. Though the earliest discoveries of the period just named, — comprising new continents and oceans, and the correction of the errors of ancient geography,—are the most striking results of this burst of human enterprise, yet no pause has since occurred in the progress of discovery. The broad lines at first sketched out have been gradually filled up in the intervening spaces; and the *terræ incognitæ* of the earth continually narrowed in extent. The motive power of steam — that mighty agent of our own time —

gives new faculties and facilities for all such research. Yet while admiring the magnificent steam vessels, which now plough the ocean, and penetrate into the interior of continents, we cannot forget what we owe to those bold navigators of an earlier age, who accomplished many of these very voyages in small barks or boats, scantily provided with all that is now deemed needful to safety and success. The early English discoverers in the Arctic seas may well be cited as examples of this hardy and intrepid race,—the worthy precursors of the men who in our own times have devoted themselves to this arduous service. We need not here catalogue the names of either date. They will stand recorded in all future history of geographical research.

Though we have spoken of the *terræ incognitæ* of the globe, as continually narrowed by modern discovery, yet is the unknown portion, or that imperfectly known, much larger than is commonly conceived. We circumnavigate it, indeed, with a commerce so vast and various, that the whole ocean surface, save that around the poles of the earth, may seem to be under our knowledge and command. We doubt not that in the end, all of land also, really permeable or profitable to man, will be brought under like subjection. But, meanwhile, there are still large gaps and voids in the interior of continents and islands, the objects of speculation to science and of adventure to future travellers. And in noticing these, as we are about to do, we at once illustrate the matter of the volumes before us, and show what yet remains to be done, before we have thoroughly mastered the surface of the world we inhabit.

We may remark here, in passing, how greatly our estimates, both as to *Space* and *Time*, those two great elements of human knowledge, are disturbed by the neglect to obtain a just comparative measure for each. Taking *space* as that with which we are now concerned, it is certain that we measure it for the most part by what we see around us; and though this loose estimate has been much corrected by modern travel, and by science brought into connexion with geography, yet is common understanding often curiously in arrear on this subject. This is true, not only as to the physical conditions of space, and its relative extent; but we bring our scanty European standard also to the numbers, civilisation, religions and social usages, of the various races peopling lands of which we know nothing yet but the coasts or borders. The philosophy of geography and of human history alike require that we should gain the widest possible horizon to our view; checking thereby those partial or false conclu-

sions which a limited knowledge is ever tending to impose upon us.

We have already spoken of the improved methods and appliances conducing to the progress of modern geography. One of the most striking of these, and the instrument as well as evidence of progress, is the modern Map:—in scale, exactness, and beauty of impression, a vast advance even upon those of half a century back;—a more wonderful contrast to the vague and faulty outlines which come down to us from the middle ages under this name. And not only faulty, but faithless also: the voids of knowledge being filled up with mountains, rivers, and cities, either wholly imaginary, or drawn from such loose report, that blanks left would have been a better alternative. The rudeness of these early attempts is often curiously shown in the scraps of landscape brought in to fill up the simpler delineation by outline. In passing from them to the maps of our own days, we seem approaching the works of a new and higher intelligence. Nor is this impression a mistaken one. The modern map,—take as the most eminent instance, that of the Ordnance Survey of the British Isles,—represents and embodies in itself the highest attainments of science and art; nor could it have been produced without them. Of the consummate accuracy of this great work—its foremost and most essential quality—we cannot give more striking proof than in the facts showing the perfect triangulation on which it is constructed. This perfection is such that in the five bases employed (varying from five to seven miles in length, and some of them 400 miles apart), the greatest difference between the measured length and that derived by mutual computation from the triangles, does not exceed three inches. Or, taking the side of any one triangle as a base, the same exact length will be reproduced, when computed through the whole or any part of the series of triangles employed. Those who are so far familiar with the subject as to comprehend the personal labours, the refinements of observation, and the nice application of the most delicate instruments needful to such operations, will appreciate all that is admirable in the results thus stated. We might name, as instances of their relation to other parts of physical science, the use of the Drummond Light for distance signals in the survey; and the observations made in its progress of the singular deflections of the plumb-line in certain places from the true direction of the zenith; showing local causes of disturbance, the study of which may hereafter carry us further and deeper in the knowledge of our planet. Nor must we omit to mention the aids

given to the Geological Survey of England, by the perfection of the Ordnance Survey. These two great works have gone on together with equal success, and mutual illustration from the methods of labour and observation in each.

This excellence in the design and execution of modern maps is not limited to our own islands. Many of the national maps of Germany, France, Italy, and Russia are little, if at all, inferior in merit; and our Indian empire may boast of a Trigonometrical Survey, which with the railroads and telegraphic lines advancing towards completion under the restored tranquillity of our dominions, will in the end bring these vast possessions into parity with the greater part of the European continent. In Australia and Canada similar government surveys are going on, at once denoting and developing the resources of those great colonies.

A map, as all know, is the delineation on a plane surface of what in nature forms a portion of a sphere, or, in strictness, an ellipsoid figure. The several methods of projection or perspective by which it is sought to obviate or lessen error in this translation from a spherical to a plane surface, are taught in most elementary books. We advert to them, merely that we may add a few words as to the relative value of the Map and Globe, as familiar exponents of geography. The former serves to all special delineations of the earth's surface; providing for any requisite degree of minuteness, and becoming free from theoretical error in proportion as the scale is enlarged. From maps we best obtain the political divisions of the earth, and all those marks which man has impressed upon its surface. But the teaching of geography in its larger relations, is best effected by the globe; that simple and cheap piece of furniture, which ought to be found in every house; giving us knowledge, not equally supplied by any map, of the great outlines of the world at large. The very ease with which its position can be varied contributes to this instruction; for here, as in so many other cases, the senses curiously overrule the reason; and by the constant collocation of the same lines under one aspect, the mind gets bound down to a single image, and its comprehension is narrowed or disturbed. To illustrate this, let any one simply turn a map upside down, and he will find eye and reason both perplexed by the inverted outline thus brought before him. Or, rotating the globe into various unwonted positions, every such change brings fresh and unexpected perceptions to the mind; dislodging errors, or teaching new truths. Thus, if we place the southern pole uppermost, we gain a due conception, not otherwise obtained, of the vastness of the ocean

surface of the globe; of the singular disproportion of land in the N. and S. hemispheres; and of the curious pyramidal projection of the African, South American, Asiatic, and Australian Capes into this world of southern waters. Such instances might be numerously given; and they have the psychological interest, just denoted, of showing how much we lie under the domination of the senses, even in the familiar case of studying the geographical outlines of the globe.

Examples of this kind illustrate more especially that method or principle of geography which looks to the broader features marked by nature on the surface of our planet, and in this way best seen and understood. Enough has been said on the importance of diligently studying these relations as a part of physical geography; and in connexion with other sciences which come into close kindred with it. Such study is now greatly aided by works on physical geography (among which that of Mrs. Somerville stands foremost in excellence), and by those exact and beautiful physical maps, illustrating the natural phenomena of the earth's surface, which we owe to the labours of Mr. Keith Johnston. One result, and a very profitable one, of this method of geographical study, has been the greater attention given to the physical history of the oceans and seas. In two former articles of this Journal, on Maury's work on the Atlantic, and Admiral Smythe's volume on the Mediterranean, we have sought to embody in the history of these two seas — more interesting to the civilised world than any others of the globe — all the conditions which rightly belong to geography, and are necessary to its completeness. This great domain of the waters of the earth forms a scantier part of our geographical knowledge than it ought to do; seeing the vast proportion of surface thus occupied; — the wonderful actions of oceanic tides, currents, winds, temperature, and evaporation ever going on; — the unceasing influence of these phenomena on all the continents and islands washed or encircled by sea; and the certainty that during the lapse of former ages vast changes by elevation or subsidence have occurred over the whole area thus denoted. The Ocean, in its different depths, is further to be regarded as the great receptacle for that waste of the land continually in progress; and at the same time as giving space and foundation for what may be hereafter new lands raised above its waters. We might yet further speak of the multitudinous forms of life tenanting its successive zones of depth; — some of them, by slow and silent succession in earlier ages, forming those great deposits, which, altered and raised out of the waters, become the

calcareous strata of our present geological series; others of these foraminifera actually building up new islands under our eyes by the working of incredible numbers, under the special instincts of their existence. Such facts may seem to appertain to what is technically termed natural history; but they belong in a larger sense to the physical history of the earth; and our knowledge of this earth can never be complete, or even exact, without comprising them under one general view.

The remainder of this article we shall occupy in a rapid survey of those researches, recent or still in progress, by which we are advancing towards such completion. England, as is her right and duty, stands foremost in these undertakings; drawing indeed upon Germany for many zealous and intrepid travellers, who in various parts of the world, Africa, Australia, and Asia, have aided in her enterprises. The mental and physical temperament of the German people alike fits them for such labours; and their education is of a kind to bring these faculties into full action. This testimony is due to the men who have worked together with us in geographical discovery; the community of race showing itself remarkably in the persistence and power of endurance so needful to success.

We begin our survey with the Oceans of the globe. Vast though their expanse is, it may yet be affirmed that every part of their surface has been explored, save only that which surrounds the two poles, and is encircled, if not actually covered throughout, with perpetual ice. All other ocean tracts have been submitted to the commerce or curiosity of man. The Pacific, the widest stretch of waters, and that last known to us, is now familiarly traversed by those many and magnificent ships which connect us with our Australian colonies; by the American trade connecting California and Oregon with the Eastern States, and with China in the west; and by those adventurous whalers, chiefly belonging to the latter nation, which roam over every part of this vast ocean, until fully laden with the spoils of the greatest living tenant of its waters. Cape Horn, once the terror of southern navigators, is now rounded every day by vessels charged with the mineral treasures of Australia. The opening of trade with Japan will make more complete our knowledge of the western part of the Pacific, and of that extraordinary chain of islands of which Japan is a member; stretching across from the Russian territory on the north-west coast point of America, to the south point of Kamschatka, under the name of the Aleutian Isles; thence southwards to Japan as the Kurile Islands; and southwards again

Vol. II (Pt. 1+2)

to the Philippine Isles, and the denser and more irregular group of the Indian Archipelago. A line of 5000 or 6000 miles in length is included in this chain; so marked in character and direction, that it is impossible, on the simplest inspection, not to see its dependence on some single physical action or change, the nature of which geology may unfold to us hereafter. Meanwhile we mention it, as a striking example of those curious relations of land and sea, which it is the business of physical geography, as a science, to study and define.

We have spoken of the poles as undiscovered parts of the ocean. Even this, however, is going a step beyond our real knowledge, since we cannot affirm either pole to be actually covered with water. No theoretical consideration requires it to be so; and the utmost stretch of discovery, northwards or southwards, has not yet reached to points where such conclusion could be finally drawn. Sir Edward Parry's daring journey upon the ice, to the north of Spitzbergen, was arrested before he had reached the latitude of 83°; and we have no authentic proof, though many doubtful stories, of any navigator having gone beyond. The captains of the old whalers were not very scrupulous as to their latitudes; and there was little check upon the desire to make a romantic tale of their near approach to the pole. Though without direct proof, however, the notion of a polar sea or basin is that generally held and expressed on our maps; with the further presumption that if it could be entered and traversed, a direct line of navigation over the pole would bring the arctic Columbus through Behring's Straits into the Pacific Ocean; a polar instead of a north-western passage; and the line from the Orkneys into the Pacific little longer than that from London to New York. Such voyage, however, will probably ever remain a matter of dreamy speculation. Though the current which checked Parry's advance, by carrying the ice to the south further than his daily progress northwards, gives sanction to the idea of a circumpolar sea; and though some have held that the maximum of cold is at the magnetic pole, and not at that of the earth, we must still presume obstacles from ice or other causes, in this unwonted course, which no science or intrepidity could hope to overcome.

Nevertheless we cannot yet consent to abandon altogether this north-polar enterprise. There still remains a channel of approach, almost wholly untried; easily accessible from our own shores; and free, as far as we know, from those local conditions of islands and ice-bound straits, which have perilled and perplexed all navigators in search of a north-western passage. We allude to the sea lying east of Spitzbergen, between these

Uttarpara Jaikrishna Public Library
Acca. No. 7[illegible]

islands and Nova Zembla. Ten or twelve days of fair navigation from the Orkneys, even without the use of steam, would bring a vessel to the latitude of discovery in this direction; or if Hammerfest were made the port of departure, half this time would suffice. A few summer or autumnal weeks, with navigation aided by steam, might go far to settle the question whether there is any such access to a polar basin; or what nearest approach is possible to this mysterious point, so important in the physical theory of the earth's rotation. Such research, moreover, might have results of more practical value. The whale and seal fishery of Great Britain, though still very considerable from the ports of Peterhead, Aberdeen, and Hull, yet, with respect to the whales at least, has notably declined of late years. Whether these animals have been thinned by destruction in their old haunts, or been led by their sagacity as mammals to seek ocean solitudes less infested by man and his harpoon,—certain it is that some of the whaling grounds, most profitable in former times, are now comparatively deserted. Recent voyages through Behring's Strait, supplementary to the quest of a north-western passage from Baffin's Bay, have disclosed a new field, already eagerly appropriated by the active whale-fishers of the New England ports. It may be, that some similar discovery will result from the exploration of the seas east of Spitzbergen; and we state this chance as a further incentive to research, in a direction hitherto unattempted, and with means in our hands unknown at any former time of arctic navigation. We own our desire that the nearest approach of man to the pole of his planet should be due to English enterprise.

Such desire is not inconsistent with the opinion we have formerly expressed as to the inexpediency of any other public expeditions on that arctic coast of North America where the labours and successes of our countrymen during a period of full forty years have given us so much to admire;—alloyed by one great calamity, which we can never cease to deplore. The name of an eminently brave and virtuous man, Sir John Franklin, is bound up with the final discovery of the north-western passage, so long sought for; and it is a melancholy satisfaction to know that he himself died in his ship, before that time of more frightful distress began, of which we are glad to be spared any further narrative or knowledge. The names of Maclure and McClintock will be joined to his in the history of the discovery, together with those of the many gallant men who bore part, by sea or land, in the earlier labours and perils of the research.

But the object of the north-western passage once attained,

those stern regions of barren isles and ice-bound seas may wisely be left again to their primitive solitude. The passage, shown to exist, is utterly useless for any human purpose. All that physical science can learn from these voyages has been already gained. The northern magnetic pole has been reached; and all the magnetic phenomena incident to the neighbourhood of this remarkable point duly recorded. The coasts of continent and islands have been geologically described; their scanty fauna and flora fully catalogued; and all other natural phenomena of land and sea, during the short summers and long dreary winters of these regions, diligently observed.

Looking to this quarter, indeed, we can see but one single motive or direction for further enterprise. This is furnished by the remarkable voyage of Dr. Kane; and the alleged sight of an open sea, stretching pole-wards, in latitude 81° 20′. Had this intrepid man been the witness himself to the discovery, we should implicitly have received it as such. But coming to him on the very inferior authority of two of his crew, and contradicted in parts by their own narrative, we must at present hesitate in believing more than that Smith's Sound, instead of a closed inlet, may be a passage to straits or sea beyond. Any further attempt to solve this doubt will probably be made by Americans, zealous to sustain the reputation of their countryman, in confirming the main result of his voyage.

From the northern, we pass by a large, but natural stretch, to the southern polar circle of the globe. The progress of discovery, for obvious reasons, has been far less active in this antarctic region. Its distance from the centres of human commerce and civilisation; the vast preponderance of ocean in this hemisphere; and the greater cold of high southern latitudes; are all causes tending to check enterprise in this direction. Nevertheless, the active spirit of the time in which we live has found a vent here as well as elsewhere; and England has still kept her foremost place in the path of discovery. The bold enterprise of some of our South Sea whalers first made known to us the South Shetland Isles, 600 miles south of Cape Horn, and other portions of more or less continuous land beyond, or further to the east; the possible parts of an antarctic continent, which has so often been the theme of geographical speculations. The question of such a continent yet lies open to future research. Three national expeditions, English, American, and French, were engaged almost simultaneously, about twenty years ago, in seeking for its solution; taking Hobarton, in Tasmania, as their point of departure. Of these expeditions, the one under Sir James Ross, admirably commanded and provided, was far the most suc-

cessful in all its issues. For two successive years Sir James Ross, already eminent as an arctic navigator, succeeded in carrying his ships nearer by several hundred miles to the antarctic pole than any preceding discoverer in these solitary seas. The extreme point attained in the first year was 78° S. lat.; the second season carried him a few miles further south, but on a different line of longitude. In these voyages and high latitudes, he traced a line of coast long enough to be designated as a continent, and made more remarkable by mountains, in many places equal to the highest of the Swiss Alps. The most wonderful of these is that named Mount Erebus — a living volcano, more than 15,000 feet in height; and further notable from its close contiguity to the southern magnetic pole. Sir James Ross reached a point within 160 miles of this pole; which was found by observation, three or four degrees further south than the position assigned to it on theory by Gauss. Had he been able to reach this spot, which local conditions rendered impossible, his would have been the singular glory of planting the British flag on each of the two magnetic poles of the earth!—a triumph almost too great for the life of one man.

The other expeditions, commanded by M. d'Urville and by Wilkes, did not succeed in reaching any such high southern latitudes, as those long before attained by Cook, Bellinghausen, and some of our South Sea whalers. They effected little in the way of discovery of land; certain imperfect delineations of coast by the American expedition, being afterwards annulled by the more complete and exact researches of the English navigators. Some public controversy grew out of this matter, upon which we are bound to say, that Sir James Ross's statements and observations are those alone which carry conviction to our minds. Meanwhile, the major question of an antarctic continent still remains unsettled, as regards its extent in longitude, and its depth in latitude towards the pole. For any further knowledge in this quarter we shall probably be indebted to the whalers in these seas. Sir James Ross repeatedly mentions the great number of whales on the edge of the antarctic icy barrier; and Australia, New Zealand, and the Falkland Isles now furnish points of departure and repair, which invite to the vigorous prosecution of this arduous and exciting occupation.

Pursuing our sketch of the progress of modern geography, we leave these 'regions of thick-ribbed ice,' and come at once to the more habitable parts of the earth; and to Europe, as holding the first place in all that pertains to the history of civilised man. Yet here, in fact, there is little to record. European geography, in the common sense of the term, is well known in every part; the

voids which remain belonging chiefly to physical geography, or to those departments of natural science which hold such close relation to the physical configuration and aspects of the globe. Certain provinces, nominally belonging to Turkey, and lying between the ancient Macedonia and the Danube, form the portion of Europe least frequented by travellers, and still imperfectly described in maps. It must be further admitted, that the complete geographical exactness required for nautical and other purposes is yet wanting in several parts of the European coasts, and has only of late been thoroughly attained even in our own island. Twenty years ago, errors still existed in the longitudes of some points on the south coast of England; minute indeed in amount, but yet needing the correction they have since obtained. Exactness is the essence of modern science; and in this case, practical reasons strongly concur with what is demanded by theory. Such exactness has been admirably applied to the measurement of arcs of the meridian; of which, that completed by Russia a few years ago, stretching over more than 25° from the mouth of the Danube to the polar sea, is among the most perfect in execution.

Our subject takes a new and wider form, as we pass forward into Asia;—that vast tract of continent stretching over an area five times that of Europe;—the seat of the most ancient, populous, and powerful empires of the world;—and the source, at successive periods, of those great migrations which have given races, nations, and languages to every other part of the globe, America even included. With these matters of history and speculation, deeply interesting though they are, and closely bound up with the geography of Asia, we have no present concern. The progress and actual state of geographical discovery in these wide countries it is not easy to delineate. The gaps in what we know of them are at once vast and irregular. India, indeed, is the only part of the Asiatic continent which has yet been thoroughly surveyed; and we have already spoken of those conditions, physical and political, which assure the completeness of our future knowledge of this noble appendage to the British Crown. Two arcs of the meridian have already been measured in India;—the second (completed by Everest, and extending over sixteen degrees) one of the most perfect ever surveyed. The great range of the Himalayas—embracing points of elevation which exceed by a perpendicular mile any other known heights in the world—has been penetrated through in various places, and its southern declivities explored;—not indeed without peril and some loss of life to the adventurers, among the wild and bigoted Tartarian or Mongolian tribes inhabiting these Trans-Himalayan regions.

We might name very many English travellers of the last thirty years, who have signalised themselves in this great field of research, and some of whom, as Cantley, Falconer, Hooker, and Thomson, have combined large discoveries in natural history with eminent services to geography. The latest, and not least successful explorers beyond the Himalayas, are three Germans, the Brothers Schlagintweit, who penetrated northwards as far as Khotaro; examining the courses of several rivers all flowing in that direction, but speedily lost to our knowledge in these wild and unfriendly regions, which seem even more difficult of approach than when Marco Polo traversed them six centuries ago. We lament to state, that one of these brothers, Adolphe, perished by the hands of barbarous tribes in Turkistan — one more added to the number of martyrs in the cause of geographical discovery. The magnificent work recently announced by Messrs. Brockhaus of Leipzig, which is to impart to the world the results of Messrs. Schlagintweit's mission to High Asia, will consist of no less than nine quarto volumes of scientific text and an atlas of three folio volumes. If we may trust the promises of the prospectus, it will be one of the most splendid and complete publications of the age.

Russia comes next to England as a civilised possessor of Asiatic territory; — a tract forming one-third of all Asia in extent; but barely accessible in its coasts, harsh and untoward in its general climate, and in its northern half habitable only under the rudest and scantiest conditions of human life. The methodised activity of Russian administration is testified, however, throughout every part of this vast dominion. Not only in its newly acquired Caucasian provinces, but also throughout the endless wilds of Siberia, it maintains supremacy over both settled and nomad populations, by an organised machinery for all purposes of government; for colonisation by free settlers or exiles; for overland traffic and the working of mines; and for the survey of the country by geographers and engineers. The protection and aids furnished to foreign travellers in Siberia may be set down to a prudent as well as generous policy. It is well known how many German naturalists — Pallas, Humboldt, Klaproth, Wrangel, and Ehrenberg, among the number — have aided, officially or otherwise, in Siberian explorations. The English travellers, fewer in number, and with less determinate objects of pursuit, cannot, with the exception of the latest of them, Mr. Atkinson, be said to have contributed much to the geography of this region. Sir G. Simpson, in the new and extraordinary circuit he made of the globe, traversing the Hudson's Bay territory from ocean to ocean, and the whole extent of the Russian

empire from Kamschatska to the Baltic, took one of those accustomed routes across Siberia, which connect together the sparsely scattered oases of human habitation in this country. The substantial progress made and still making in Siberian geography, is greatly due to the Imperial Geographical Society, which gives direction and aid, to the labours of the scientific travellers sent on these remote missions of discovery. The names of Orloff, Ussultzoff, Radde, Veniukoff, are already known by their successful researches, chiefly in the provinces to the east of Lake Baikal, in the valley of the Vittino and other tributaries of the Lena; and further to the south along the borders of Chinese Tartary, and among the rivers which flow into the Amúr. The latter river, ranking as one of the largest rivers in the world, though *beyond* the Russian frontier, has been officially surveyed in various parts of its course; and the extent and configuration of its vast basin approximately ascertained.* We have a right to presume that other motives beyond geographical curiosity have prompted these particular researches. The Chinese have conceded to Russia the mouth of the Amúr; useless to themselves, but prospectively very important to Russian relations with the eastern Asiatic empires. By far the most important contribution to the history of these regions is to be found in Mr. Atkinson's second and recent publication on the Upper and Lower Amúr—a work which derives equal interest from his well-stored portfolio and from his pen; though we confess we should have read the narrative of this traveller with greater scientific confidence if his adventures had been somewhat less romantic and his love of the picturesque less strongly marked. It is impossible to overrate the importance of the Russian settlements on the Amúr to that Empire, as, what the Germans call, a World-Power. Her navy is thus released from the land-locked seas which bound the Baltic and Black Sea coasts; and Russia finds herself in a commanding position in the Northern Seas of China and Japan at the very time when these territories are becoming more nearly connected with the rest of the world. This consideration gives a very high degree of interest to Mr. Atkinson's travels; though, as regards the Russian settlements on the Lower Amúr, his latest volume does not entirely redeem the promise held out by its title.

Of the northern portion of Siberia, bordering for some thou-

* In the Journal of the Geographical Society for 1858, will be found the translation of a long and very valuable memoir on the Amúr, the result of this survey.

sand miles on the Arctic Ocean — the country of the Samoyedes and other half-starving tribes—we have little to say, since very little is known, beyond the course of the three mighty rivers, which traverse it in their passage from the central parts of the continent to the sea. The exit of these rivers is such in latitude that they could never minister to external commerce, even were the countries through which they flow more prolific of produce than they are likely to become. Baron Wrangel has been the intrepid explorer of these high northern latitudes in Siberia, and we owe to him most of what we know of them. His expedition over the ice from the mouth of the Lena towards Behring's Straits ranks as one of the most arduous feats in northern enterprise. We further obtain from him a confirmation of the facts before furnished by Pallas, Middendorf, and others, of the enormous deposits of the tusks, bones, and even carcasses of elephants, on the banks and near the mouths of those great Siberian rivers, which enter the sea beyond the arctic circle;—a strange problem in natural history, and hardly yet solved, even by the ability which Sir C. Lyell has brought to bear upon it.

We have just spoken of Chinese Tartary, and this notice brings before us that vast central region of Asia, two-thirds of which is thus denominated—a vague name for a vague dominion. The other or western part of this region is as vaguely known under the name of Independent Tartary; the whole area stretching from the Caspian and Sea of Aral to the coasts opposite Japan, with a breadth in latitude of from twelve to twenty degrees—a space well nigh doubling Europe in total extent. Scarcely can we give the name of geography to the scanty and broken knowledge we have of these countries. We may be said best to know them, though this also very obscurely, through the history of those successive swarms and races of people, which migrated thence as invaders or settlers of the more fertile and temperate regions of southern Asia and Europe. No field of geographical discovery equal to this in extent and interest exists on the globe. Little more than the mere margin has yet been passed by the civilised travellers of our own day; but here again we must refer to our countryman, Mr. Atkinson, as one of the most intelligent and successful of these. His travels during several years, which were undertaken for the express purpose of depicting the scenery of a continent hitherto so little known to civilised man, carried him through many unexplored parts of the Altai chain and the Kirghiz deserts, forming the border line of Russian and Chinese empire. The Russian Government is actively pursuing research in this direction; but it is still only

a frontier to the enormous tract of almost unknown continent described above; and Central Asia yet remains a sort of mythical region to our knowledge. Even aided by the authority of Humboldt and Klaproth; we can hazard little more than conjecture as to its physical outlines and geography. Taking the Altai and Himalayan chains in their extreme prolongation, as forming its northern and southern boundary, we have as an intervening belt those vast Mongolian and Tartarian steppes, vaguely called in part the Desert of Gobi; elevated more than 4000 feet, and stretching, it is believed, fully 4000 miles from east to west. We have reason to suppose these steppes to be traversed or interrupted by other mountain ranges, parallel, we may presume, to the great border chains; and the journey of the brothers Schlagintweit indicated one such range of great elevation, which they believed to be identical with the Kuen-Luen chain of Humboldt. But we cannot go further here than to point out this part of Asia as a wide field for future adventure; —adventure sanctioned not solely by common curiosity, but by the certainty of finding, in its physical character and natural history, objects of high interest to science. The fauna and flora of a region so peculiar in position and surface, must needs afford much that is new and curious to the naturalist; while the ethnologist may perchance discover here some rudimental traces, serving to the better understanding of those vast migrations, by which the shepherds of the steppes of Central Asia have more than once shaken the world.

The geography of China Proper is becoming every day better known, through that strange medley of simultaneous war and commerce which for many years has been our normal relation to a people equally singular in their language and religion, as in all their institutions and usages of life. Yet this knowledge is still very much confined to the maritime provinces, and probably does not equal that acquired by the Jesuits, during their early and successful missions to China. The journey accomplished by Huc and Baudot from Pekin to Lassa, affords recent proof of what may be effected by that corporate zeal, which, while usurping the character of religion, has given such continuous vitality to the wonderful institutions of the Roman Catholic Church: but in this, as in some other instances, the zeal of the missionaries for the triumph of their faith, and perhaps the simplicity of their characters, detract considerably from the services they might have rendered to scientific investigation. Our former diplomatic missions to Pekin, even though returning across the empire, have travelled under such close constraint as to make very slender additions to our knowledge of its vast interior.

The more recent voyage of Lord Elgin up the Yang-tze-keang to Han-kow, 600 miles from the mouth of this great river, the *girdle* of China, forms a remarkable step in the progress of Chinese discovery. It is a stream doubtless destined hereafter, under the agency of steam, to become one of the great watery highways of the world. Population clusters in crowded cities along its banks, and cultivation is rich in its tributary valleys. It gives opening to that wide western portion of China, of which we know little save from native report; but which may hereafter, through this channel, enter largely into the traffic of nations. The establishment of a British factory at Han-kow, which would create a market to European trade in that part of the Empire, and open the navigation of the Yan-tze-keang to our ships, is strenuously advocated by the naval officers who accompanied Lord Elgin in that expedition. What the events now in progress in the empire, from European force and native rebellion, may bring about, we hardly dare surmise, so often have all expectations been frustrated in this quarter. But half a century now is more prolific of change than any five centuries heretofore; and China, with all its immobility of ages, cannot escape that tide which is sweeping over and amalgamating, through commerce or conquest, all other nations of the earth.

Those portions of Asia which appertain to the Persian and Turkish Empires, though better known than the interior of China, yet present still great *lacunæ* in our knowledge; and are nowhere laid down with the exactness which modern geography requires. The more perfect examination of these countries will have a further and higher interest in illustrating the history of the most ancient periods, and most remarkable races of mankind. It is a region where fable and reality come concurrently before us;—sometimes in conflict, sometimes in mutual illustration. The wonderful results of the labours of Rawlinson, Layard, and Botta in the ancient Assyria, and those more recently obtained by Mr. Graham in the Hauran, the scene of the deplorable events which have again drawn a French army to the coast of Syria, are the augury and index of what may be accomplished by further research. We still want the more ancient links which connect together the several branches of the Aryan and Semitic races, their languages and migrations; and it is in these regions of Asia, if any where, that we may look for such illustration. Spectral shadows of history, they must be at best; yet worth all that labour and enterprise can do for their recovery.

There yet remains a portion of Asia, almost equal to half of Europe in extent, but which, from position and physical characters, might better perhaps come under the African division

of the globe. This is Arabia; separated from Africa only by that long and narrow cleft, which filled from the Indian ocean, has borne from ancient time the name of the Rea Sea. Along this extraordinary gulf continually pass those magnificent steamers which connect England by the shortest transit with her Indian Empire;—the electric telegraph has been laid underneath its waters;—the fortress of Aden, our Gibraltar of this sea, guards its narrow egress into the Indian Ocean;—the mountain group of Sinai, and the two cities which cradled the religion now dominant in the East, lie upon its Arabian shores. And yet the vast tract, forming the whole interior of Arabia, is completely a *terra incognita* to geography;—its physical aspects, its animal and vegetable products, its human population, all alike unknown to European eyes. Even the boldest mapmakers have not gone beyond a narrow coast margin, with some imaginary mountain ranges, and a few vague lines of native travel from the Red Sea to the Persian Gulf. But inference comes here in the place of observation. The absence of any great river estuaries on its coasts, the character of the adjoining countries, and the scanty notices obtained from native sources, all justify the belief that the interior of Arabia is a vast sandstone desert; with scattered oases like those of the Sahara, the vague domiciles of wandering Arab tribes, who feebly represent that extraordinary race, which in the 7th and 8th centuries, under the fervour of a new faith, conquered or shook some of the greatest empires of the world. That such events should have had their origin on the coasts of that desert region, is a fact which history records, but cannot easily explain.

From Arabia we pass by a short step to Africa;—a Continent abounding from the earliest time in geographical problems, several of which are even now only partially solved. The question as to its being circumnavigable or not; as to the sources of the Nile; the extent of the Great Desert; and the existence beyond of lofty mountains and a great river flowing eastwards,—these were points of speculation to ancient geographers, from the time of Herodotus to Ptolemy, Strabo, Seneca, and Pliny. We have no space to enter fully into these subjects, or into the Arabian researches in Africa several centuries later. We must limit ourselves to the notice of recent discoveries only; and even this more briefly than is due to their real and relative value. It is a continent we may well seek to know more intimately; not merely from curiosity or the contingent benefits it may afford to commerce and manufacture, but for the better prevention of the curse of slavery which has long hung heavily over this part of the world. Looking to extent only, it forms

pretty nearly a fifth part of the total land of the globe. On a rude estimate we may say that one third of this vast area is wholly unknown; another third so scantily known, as to furnish little more to maps than the single lines of travellers or caravans. The portions thus described form the great interior of the African Continent. Its coasts are in every part more familiar to us;—a knowledge dearly purchased by that cruel and disgraceful traffic to which we have just alluded. But the best general notion of African geography may be gained by taking successive zones of latitude from north to south; which division, suggested by diversities of physical aspect, as well as by the direction of recent discovery, we shall here adopt.

The northern zone, bordering on the Mediterranean, from Morocco to Egypt, is that best known to us. Algeria, to the distance of more than 300 miles inland, and including the several ranges of what are called the Atlas Mountains, has been thoroughly surveyed by its French possessors; while Egypt and the valley of the Nile are becoming as familiar to us as the courses of the Rhone and the Danube. Morocco, Tunis, and Tripoli are less perfectly known as they recede from the coast; but their proximity to Europe makes it certain that these countries will eventually be opened, either by conquest or commerce. South of this coast zone comes that of the Sahara; a name vaguely applied to the greatest desert of the globe; stretching its high and sandy plateau from the Atlantic to the confines of Egypt and Nubia; with an average breadth, ill defined indeed, of at least 800 miles. Various lines of travel and traffic traverse this wilderness, determined chiefly by the oases scattered over its surface; some of these large enough to give abode to wild tribes of the Touarik and Tibboo races; others mere patches of vegetation around the springs which here and there well upwards from the arid surface. The most extensive exploration of the Sahara which has yet been made is due to Colonel Daumas, of the French Staff in Algeria, and M. Carette, whose reports were reviewed in this journal some years ago.* The first modern travellers who crossed the Sahara from Tripoli to its southern border were Denham and Clapperton, in 1822; followed, after the intervention of other less successful efforts, by the expedition, familiar to our readers, of which Dr. Barth alone survived to relate the history. The names of his companions are added to the record of the many martyrs of African discovery, who have succumbed under the malign influences of climate, privation, or the fanatic cruelty of the native tribes.

* Ed. Rev., No. clxix., July, 1846.

Dr. Barth's volumes, though somewhat arid in style, like the country they describe, give a faithful picture of the physical aspect of the Sahara, and of the people scattered over its few habitable parts.* But they have a higher interest in relation to what we would call the third African zone; stretching across the widest part of the continent, from the Guinea Coast to Abyssinia; and in its southern boundary, though very vaguely defined, coming within six or eight degrees of the equator. Strikingly contrasted with the desert plateaux to the north, this is a region of varied or mountainous surface; of rivers, lakes, and periodical rains; and, in effect of these conditions, a region of profuse equatorial vegetation; and with a large and prosperous negro population, where not blasted by Arab rule, or by the wars which minister victims to the foreign slave trade. The English and French occupy, by their settlements, the mouths of some of the chief rivers on the Atlantic coasts; and it was from this side that the first attempts were made by Mungo Park to enter the interior, to reach Timbuctoo, and to solve the mystery of that great river, flowing eastward to some termination then unknown. The northern line across the Sahara furnished the next access to this middle African region, accomplished by the intrepid travellers already mentioned. In a second expedition, starting from the Guinea Coast, Clapperton perished; but his bold and intelligent servant, Landor, returning, in 1830, by the same route into the interior, finally solved the question as to the Niger or Quorra, which had so long held geographers in doubt. To Dr. Barth, however, we owe our better acquaintance with the countries between Lake Tchad and Timbuctoo; while, stretching southwards from this lake, he reached the banks of the Tchadda, of which the Niger is now found to be the western feeder. Entering the ocean at the Bight of Benin, this mighty river furnishes a third and more facile access to Central Africa; and, though the first attempts to ascend it were disastrous, or only partially successful, we believe this to be the channel through which commerce and civilisation will chiefly find their future passage.

To the south of these remarkable countries comes another wide zone of this continent, which no European foot has ever yet crossed. The coasts on each side are known; and especially those of the Portuguese settlements, bordering on the Congo, and in the vicinity of Mozambique. Though deeper ingress has recently been obtained on the eastern side, there still re-

* See Ed. Rev., No. ccxxii., April, 1858, for a review of Dr. Barth's 'Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa.'

mains a tract equal to two-thirds of Europe in extent, utterly untrodden and unknown; a field for curious discovery, even if not otherwise rewarding European enterprise. The great physical question now pending as to this portion of Africa is, whether it be a country of lofty mountain ranges, ministering to periodical river floods by the melting of snows? or an elevated plateau or basin, the receptacle of the six months' equinoctial rains, and the feeder thence, through lakes or saturated morasses, of these river inundations? To Sir R. Murchison we owe the first clear suggestion of the latter view; and though still based chiefly on general physical considerations, all subsequent discovery has tended more or less to its confirmation.

In the introduction to Dr. Beke's admirable 'Essay on the 'Sources of the Nile,' and also in the remarks prefixed by Mr. Ravenstein to Dr. Krapf's 'Travels in Eastern Africa,' the great principles are clearly pointed out which have effected a total change in our conception of the physical features of the whole African continent. The principal mountain system of Africa is now found to extend from north to south, in proximity with the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean, instead of running from east to west across the continent, as laid down by all maps ancient and modern. Dr. Beke argues, that the fundamental cause of the erroneous notions respecting Africa is, that Europeans have always approached that continent in a wrong direction, and that the survey of the country must proceed, not from the Deserts of the north, or from the fever-stricken rivers of the west, but from the plateau or table-land of Eastern Africa; where, in fact, the highly important discoveries of the Lake Tanganyika and Lake Nyansa have lately been made. In truth, however, the existence of these inland seas was undoubtedly known to the Portuguese geographers of the 16th century, and they are laid down in the older maps.

And here it is that we touch upon that sovereign problem of African geography, the true sources of the Nile; or of that western branch of this river, which, under the name of the White Nile, brings down the great mass of its waters into Nubia and Egypt. It is a problem inherited from the earliest ages, and has an interest well sanctioned by the singular features of this wonderful stream. In an article before alluded to, on the Mediterranean Sea, we spoke of the Nile, as the most remarkable river of the world; as well in its physical characters, as in its associations with human history. In mere length and volume it is surpassed by some, though by few only. Other tropical rivers have their periodical inundations; but none come recorded to us

for a period of many thousand years, as giving not fertility alone, but its very soil and existence to the land of Egypt. No other river on the globe has the physical peculiarity of flowing for the last 1200 miles through rainless regions, and receiving not a single stream for this vast distance. Without noticing other physical singularities, as the Etesian winds, &c. we may simply advert further to what Sir T. Brown calls '*those wild enormities of ancient magnanimity*,'—the wonderful works of art, labour, and magnificence, which crowd the Nubian and Egyptian valley of the Nile; belonging to a time only faintly reached by fragmentary records, but forming in themselves a living history and picture of these remote ages. No river or region of the world puts before the eye of the traveller such marvellous memorials of the past.

Our classical readers will recollect the fine passage in the 10th Book of Lucan's 'Pharsalia,' in which Cæsar, inflamed by a passion for geographical discovery, exclaims to the Hierophant Achoreus:—

> 'Tantus amor veri, nihil est quod noscere malim,
> Quam fluvii causas per secula tanta latentis,
> Ignotumque caput: spes est mihi certa videndi
> Niliacos fontes: bellum civile relinquam.'

The Egyptian proceeds to describe the mysteries which concealed, and which still conceal, the sources and the flow of the mysterious river:—

> 'Quæ tibi noscendi Nilum, Romane, cupido est,
> Et Phariis, Persisque fuit, Macetumque tyrannis;
> Nullaque non ætas voluit conferre futuris
> Notitiam: sed vincit adhuc natura latendi.'

The answer which was addressed to Cæsar, must still be given by the learned President of the Geographical Society; of the great river thus characterised, the main source is at this moment still unknown. But a very short time will, it is our belief, solve the question. All former attempts to do so, from the exploration ordered by Nero, to the later enterprises of English, German, and French travellers, have been made by ascending the river from the north. In tracing the great branch, called the Blue Nile, to its sources in the Abyssinian mountains, Bruce gained a repute beyond the real value of his discovery. The origin of the White Nile, bringing a far larger volume of waters to the confluence at Khartoun, and clearly coming from a more southern region, was still to be found. Followed upwards as a large stream to within three degrees of the Equator, it became clear that its sources lay beyond this line, and research now

took a new direction; that which gives the promise of final success. From the east coast of Africa, a little south of the equator, the missionaries Krapff and Rebmann penetrated westwards, far enough to come within sight of mountains seemingly capped with snow; and, if really so, at least 18,000 feet in height. These travels, related in a work lately published, have been followed by the far more remarkable expedition of Burton and Speke; the narrative of which occupies nearly the whole of the last volume of the Geographical Society, and is also given, in a more popular and amusing form, in the two volumes recently published by Captain Burton himself. The main results of this expedition are briefly as follows. Even as early as three centuries ago, the Portuguese — a people of marvellous prowess in those days, — obtained knowledge of one or more great lakes in the interior of Africa, east of Zanzibar; but these intimations were well nigh lost to the world, until recently confirmed by the reports of native traders, who described to the consuls and missionaries on the coast, what might be interpreted, though vaguely, as an inland sea. The discoveries of Burton and Speke have done much to settle this question. From Zanzibar, 6° south of the equator, crossing a coast range of mountains, and proceeding westwards nearly 600 miles, they reached the great fresh-water lake of Tanganyika; 1850 feet above the sea, fully 300 miles in length, and from 20 to 50 in breadth. This inland water they navigated so near to its north extremity, as to make it almost certain that no stream finds egress through the mountains which subtend it on this side. No such negative evidence, however, exists as to the still greater lake Nyanza, lying about 200 miles north-east of the former. The southern extremity of this lake, here 90 miles in width, Captain Speke reached alone; his companion being detained on the road by illness. We may at once avow our belief that if any single lake-basin represents the main source of the Nile, Nyanza is that lake.* From 2½° south latitude, where Speke reached its shores, and nearly in the meridian of the White Nile at a point 3° north of the equa-

* It should, however, be stated, that Captain Burton entirely dissents from this opinion, which has been so ably advocated by his late companion. He argues, on the contrary, that between the upper portion of the Nyanza and the watershed of the White Nile, there probably exists a longitudinal range of elevated ground, and that the true sources of the 'Holy River' will be found to be a network of runnels and rivulets of scanty dimensions, filled by monsoon torrents, and perhaps a little swollen by melted snow from the Eastern Lunar Mountains.

tor, this fresh-water sea, on credible native report, stretches far northwards; reducing the unknown intermediate distance to so short a span, as almost to force upon us the notion of connexion and continuity. The level of Lake Nyanza was found to be nearly 4000 feet above the sea; an elevation that tallies well with all that is required by the physical phenomena of the Nile. Other lakes or morasses on this high level north of the equator, such as the Bahmel-Ghazal, recently described by Mr. Petherick, doubtless contribute to form this great river and its periodical floods, under the influence of the tropical rains, common to the whole region. These rains, in their time, duration, and violence, can alone explain the Nile inundation. Admitting snow-capped mountains under the equator, the melting of such snow must be far too uniform to account for periods of flood thus strongly marked by the hand of nature. And as the poet Lucan observed, the period of the Nile inundation does not coincide with that of floods caused by the melting of snows.

Captain Speke left England again six months ago for the scene of his hitherto fortunate labours, and with the determinate object of following the Lake Nyanza into the Nile, if such connexion exist. He carried with him various aids, but none of such efficacy as his own energy and experience. If he really does emerge from the lake upon the river, and thence follows the Nile downwards into Egypt, he will have accomplished the greatest geographical feat of the age. Two years at furthest will suffice to decide the question.

We have dwelt disproportionately on this subject, yet hardly beyond what its interest warrants, seeing especially the illustration these researches afford to the general geography of Africa, and to the discoveries of Dr. Livingstone in that more southern zone of this continent which is defined by the course of the Zambesi and its tributary rivers. The Portuguese, with settlements on each coast, were the first to traverse this part of the African continent; but what they thus effected was valueless to the world at large, and in its connexion with the slave traffic pernicious to the country itself. Not so the better directed and more intelligent enterprises of Dr. Livingstone, who has already placed before us a wide field for future culture; and whose present mission, though checked by some untoward beginnings, promises much as well for geographical science, as for the spread of a more genial European policy into this great river region.

To the several zones we have described as defining the geography of Africa, succeeds that extreme part of the conti-

nent extending from the Zambesi to the Cape of Good Hope;—a various region, remarkable in the races of its native population (amongst whom the Kaffirs in every sense stand foremost), and in the other forms of life tenanting its deserts, hills, forests, and rivers. Dr. Robert James Mann has given us a very useful and accurate account of the geographical features of the colony of Port Natal, which is probably one of the most salubrious and promising British settlements on the face of the globe. The southern extremity of the African continent which forms the Cape Colony and British Kaffraria has been made well known to us by the misfortune of military as well as civil operations. Now, happily, it has again become the seat of peaceful rule, and prosperous commerce and colonisation.

We come now, by geographical sequence, to the great island continent of Australia;—that land of problems and paradoxes in every part of its physical history; in nothing more strange than in its human relation to our own small island, on the opposite point of the globe's circumference. The first English settlers, chiefly convicts, landed at Sydney seventy-two years ago. A population of more than a million now dwells in these colonies; intelligent, energetic, and wealthy, possessing the political institutions and freedom of the mother country, and maintaining all the usages of English social life, even to the very pastimes which amuse and give vigour to our youth. A file of Sydney or Melbourne newspapers of this day may fairly be counted as one of the most curious documents in the history of our race. We have no room, however, to dilate on these matters, or on those strange peculiarities in its native Fauna and Flora, which distinguish Australia from all other regions of the globe. Many of these anomalies are becoming obliterated by the ingress of European life in its different forms. Here, as elsewhere, the white man is gradually displacing the coloured races; bringing with him the animals and plants of another hemisphere to minister to the wants or luxuries of his new life. It is not, however, simple colonisation which has peopled and given fortune to this new continent. The rush to the Californian gold region was still going on, when the discovery of still more prolific gold-fields on the flanks of the eastern mountain chain of Australia—a discovery sagaciously anticipated by Sir R. Murchison—directed a sudden stream of migration towards these distant lands, which four months of ocean voyage could not check, and which is still going on to enlarge their population and wealth. Upon this topic, however, it would be needless to enter here. An Australian literature—social, descriptive, and statistical—has grown up together with the other productions of this great

colony; and there are parts even of our own island less familiar to us than the country around Sydney and Melbourne, or the gold-fields of Ballarat.

Still what we thus familiarly know is little more than the margin of the Antarctic continent. From its eastern coast alone discovery has been extended to distances of 700 or 800 miles from the sea; and this in scanty lines and at the cost of much privation and suffering to the adventurers. The larger portion of the coasts is known but by maritime survey, and the vast interior is still a void in our geography. In several respects, either proved or presumed, Australia has much resemblance to Africa in its physical features;—a circuit of coast, with very few inlets or gulfs; the highest mountain ranges on its eastern side; an arid saline desert within, touching in parts on the sea, particularly on that long and dreary line of southern coast, which Mr. Eyre with vast powers of endurance, successfully explored. The existence of this great central desert, the Sahara of the South, though not proved by actual passage across it, is attested to us in every way short of such proof. Without reciting the names of the many eminent travellers who have been engaged during the last twenty-five years, officially or otherwise, in their arduous efforts to reach the interior, we may state generally that from whatsoever point of direction ingress has been attempted, a waterless and barren desert has been eventually reached, frustrating all further advance. In this desert, entering it from the east, we have cause to presume that Leichardt and his companions perished. Of its eastern boundary we now know more from the recent and very remarkable journey of Mr. Gregory: who, going in search of Leichardt, traversed the continent by the long inland line from Moreton Bay (now the new colony of Queen's Land) to Adelaide, in South Australia. This traveller had already gained reputation and the gold medal of the Geographical Society for his eminent services in the North Australian expedition of 1855, which, entering the continent at the mouth of the Victoria River, proceeded to the S. and S.W. until arrested, about 300 miles from the coast, by the same sandy wilderness which had already in so many places baffled the enterprise of the Australian traveller.

Other physical proofs of the desert character of this great central region are afforded by the paucity and scanty size of the Australian rivers, of which the Murray alone seems fitted for continuous steam navigation; and by those dry, scorching and sandy winds, blowing from the interior, which are so *feelingly* described by all recent colonists. The suspicion of a central lake, though it cannot be disproved upon our present

knowledge, yet is now entertained by few. Many vast tracts of fertile country, profitable for settlement, will doubtless yet be discovered between the desert and the sea; of which the recent discoveries of Mr. Stuart to the north-west of Lake Torrens furnish a fortunate example. But taking its physical characters in their totality, Australia seems destined to become a *Coast Empire* only; though vast enough, as such, to satisfy all the imaginings of the future. It is impossible not to feel pride in the relation of England to this southern world. Whether it remain ours in colonial union, or be peaceably dissevered by the events of the future (*peaceably* we say, because such a war as that of the American revolution can never recur), Australia will still be English in its language, literature, and political life. We shall not only have created a nation out of a wilderness, but shall have ennobled the people so created, by the gift of institutions, which the struggles and experience of centuries have happily won for ourselves.

Though the sovereignty of Australia is virtually conceded to England, and the most profitable parts of its territory already occupied by our colonies, we are led with Sir R. Murchison to regret that no settlement has been made on the northern coast. The proximity to the equator is a drawback; and we have reason to suppose the margin of fertile lands narrower and less productive. Still we cannot but believe that on the shores of the Gulf of Carpentaria, or elsewhere on this coast, there are spots profitable for colonisation, for commercial intercourse with the Indian Archipelago, and for future overland communication with the northern settlements of the eastern coast. The energy, which has done so much for us in this region of the globe, will doubtless in the end accomplish the object to which we allude.

Our record of geographical research, however brief, cannot omit mention of the great islands which lie variously grouped over the vast spaces of the Indian Ocean. Madagascar, Borneo, and New Guinea, the three largest, covering six times the surface of the British Isles, are still scarcely known to us but in their coasts. Wherever adventure has been carried within, — and in the Indian Archipelago the Dutch, led by commercial instincts, have ever been the most active and successful explorers,—these islands give large promise of internal resources, mineral and vegetable; while their Fauna, including the races of men which tenant them, offers endless objects of curious speculation to the naturalist. Sumatra and Java are better known to us; the latter island, with its long line of living volcanos, forming part of that vast volcanic belt, nearly

3000 miles in length, which traverses the Indian Archipelago; skirting or crossing those crystalline and sedimentary formations, to which the same subterranean forces have probably given their island elevation, as well as the rare and precious metallic deposits seemingly so abundant in this region. The vicinity of this great island group to Australia will doubtless hasten that better knowledge of their geography and productions, which, considering their extent and position, it is fitting we should have. There are obstacles from tropical climate and savage population. But European enterprise has overcome these elsewhere, and will do so here. A handsome volume recently published in Amsterdam, under the title, 'Fastes Militaires des Indes Orientales Néerlandaises,' by Captain Gerlach, is the most complete record with which we are acquainted of the prowess and enterprise of the Dutch settlers in the East, which have enabled them to found a colonial empire and a trade in that archipelago second only to that of Britain.

The Philippine Islands have been vaguely known to us through the feeble sovereignty of Spain. Those, far more important, which form the empire of Japan, after sundry singular fluctuations of European intercourse, ending in its almost entire exclusion, are now opening themselves to our commerce; —precariously, however, and under a certain compulsion, which we would fain hope may hereafter take a more settled and tranquil form. In a recent article we have spoken of Mr. Oliphant's valuable work, as one provoking the desire for further and more intimate knowledge of those islands; extraordinary in their physical features, rich in their productions, and peopled by a race peculiar in their language, and in their political and social institutions. Many curious questions will be solved by our closer intimacy with Japan. We earnestly hope they may be solved by peaceful intercourse; without those intermediate stages of struggle and bloodshed which have defaced our relations with the neighbouring empire of China.

There yet remains, to complete our rapid survey, that great double Continent of the West, forming fully a third part of the total solid land of the globe. Wholly hidden from our knowledge until about three and a half centuries ago, the two continents of America are nevertheless now more familiar to us than many parts of the world which came within the scope of ancient geography. In North America the energy of the Anglo-Saxon race, whether independent or still under British sovereignty, has carried lines of travel across the most sterile and mountainous tracts between the two oceans; and to the mouths

of the rivers which, issuing from a wild region of forests and lakes, empty themselves into the Arctic Sea. The active spirit of westward colonisation in the United States,—the need of direct overland communication between the Eastern States and those newly created on the Pacific,—the successive abstraction of Mexican provinces on the west and south,—and even the absurd fanaticism of the Mormon immigrants—have all tended, within the last fifteen years especially, to open out these vast countries to our knowledge. Railways already traverse the prairies of the Mississippi and ascend the valley of the Missouri; while steamboats make their way up the latter river, a thousand miles above the confluence of these two mighty streams. The Rocky Mountains, the great watershed of this continent, are yielding their difficult and dangerous passes to the enterprise of traders or settlers;— the Indian tribes are disappearing under the pressure of this new race; and an overland post now performs regular journies between California and the older states of the Atlantic coast. The able surveyors of Canada and the United States will speedily fill up the gaps which yet remain in the geography of the central and southern portion of the N. American continent. By far the most important of these works is the narrative of the route from Canada to British Columbia, published by Professor Hind, of Toronto, who went in charge of the Canadian Assinniboine and Saskatchewan Exploring Expedition. The maps and illustrations of this publication are of great scientific value, and it deserves especial notice as a contribution of the Canadians themselves to the knowledge of the vast territory which is the inheritance of their own descendants, and which forms so large a portion of the British-American Empire.

The British possessions on this continent, lying to the north and west of the flourishing provinces of Canada, cover an enormous extent of surface, well nigh equal to the total area of Europe, but hitherto solely or chiefly known to us as the great hunting territory of the Hudson's Bay Company.* It disputes with the kindred region of Siberia the claim of being the greatest *fur-producing* country of the globe. The conditions of climate and surface are such that three-fourths of its extent will probably ever remain a breeding ground for the wild animals of the chase. But the eager spirit of enterprise has of late awakened the question whether the southern borders of this vast territory be not open to profitable agricultural settlement,

* See Ed. Rev., vol. cix., p. 122., for an article on the 'Hudson's 'Bay Territory.'

especially along the valleys of the Saskatchewan and its subordinate streams. An exploring expedition sent out by the Colonial Office about three years ago, under Captain Palliser, in relation to this object, has already obtained many valuable results; among which we may especially notice the observations of Dr. Hector on the passes over the Rocky Mountains; showing certain of them to be lower and more facile of transit than any others yet known across this great mountain chain. The scale of operation, however, is so vast in these surveys, that it is needful to await their further extension, before any practical measure can be founded upon them. Meanwhile we are rapidly gaining knowledge of our colony of British Columbia, on the Pacific side of the mountains; incited at the present moment by the golden harvest there, but justified for the future by the prospects of those more tranquil and lasting harvests, promised by a fine climate and fertile soils. It is our belief that Canada and this new colony of the West will eventually be united by a belt of settlements between the boundary of the United States and 52° or 53° N. L. But, even with the aid of railroads and continuous emigration, half a century may be required to work out this result.

The summary we have thus given of the actual state of geographical knowledge, will show at once the voids still remaining to be filled up, and the energy and intelligence engaged in fulfilment of this work. The number and extent of such void places in geography will probably surprise those not accustomed to large views of the world they inhabit. Another century, however,—perhaps even less,—will make us masters of all that is really worthy of attainment. And as, in thus discovering new lands fitted for human habitation, it is clear that we are in effect providing for a larger amount of human life on the globe, we can but express our earnest hope that a higher and more diffused civilisation may obviate or lessen those evils which are the appurtenances of an over-crowded world, and which put to severest trial the political, social, and religious institutions of mankind.

ART. II.—*Memoirs of the Insurrection in Scotland in* 1715. By JOHN, MASTER OF SINCLAIR. From the Original Manuscript in the possession of the Earl of Rosslyn. With Notes by Sir WALTER SCOTT, Bart. Printed at Edinburgh (for the Abbotsford Club): 1858.

THERE is a rather remarkable dearth of personal testimony from the Jacobite side about the two renowned insurrections of the eighteenth century for the restoration of the Stuarts. The events of the great civil war of the preceding century are abundantly narrated by men who, from some eminent position, civil or military, saw what they told. From the posthumous honours which popular literature has obtained for the heroes of the small but stirring contests in which our civil wars died out, it would not naturally be anticipated that any of them would be ashamed to tell us his career. Yet of those two wondrous marches into England, which ended the one in the defence of Preston, the other in the retreat from Derby, we have but scanty and fragmentary memorials. Of the later affair a brief narrative was written by Andrew Lumisden, a man of scholarly pursuits, who, after an unnoticed career in Prince Charles Edward's army, spent his latter days in Italy, where he wrote 'Remarks on the Antiquities of Rome and its Environs.' Lumisden's narrative was afterwards woven by John Home into his History of the Rebellion. The very questionable memoirs of the Chevalier Johnston, and some scraps of narrative published by Mr. Chambers in his Jacobite Memoirs, almost exhaust all that the Jacobite heroes of the '45 seem to have had to tell the world. In the state trials, however, in private letters and public documents, and the newspapers and magazines of the day, there exist abundant materials for a history of the romantic little war which brought the almost forgotten exile into the heart of England. And there will be a further addition to our means of information when the memoirs of Dr. Carlyle, the friend of Hume and Robertson, who saw the battle of Preston Pans and other events of the period, are published.

For the history of the insurrection of 1715 we have still fewer materials; and this is the more to be regretted since, though less prolific in romantic incidents, it is of far deeper significancy and importance in the constitutional history of Britain. For all that has been said of the alarm in London, when the Highlanders were known to be at Derby, and the stories how the Duke of Newcastle hid himself that he might give his

unbiassed reflections to the claims of the Stuart dynasty on his loyalty,—no one who looks at the force in the hands of the Government and to the known temper of the English people, can think of ultimate success to the expedition as an event that ever was within the range of possibilities. How long the insurgents might have held the Highlands, and what trouble they might have given while possessed of that stronghold, if such had been the limit of their ambition, it is hard to say. But the march into England, marvellously audacious as it was, and as marvellously successful, was but a Highland raid on a large scale,—a sort of expedition which leaves no permanent results even as the fruit of success, and finds its natural completion in a retreat as rapid as the advance has been.

The affair of the '15, on the other hand, was a constitutional crisis, second only to that of the Revolution itself in the imminence of the risk and the value of the success. The strength of a piece of constitutional mechanism, of English structure entirely, and unexampled in any other part of the world, was about to undergo its last and most formidable trial. Down to this juncture it can scarcely be said that the Stuarts had lost the throne; for William during the few years when he reigned a widower alone, held it for the Princess Anne, and he was himself a nephew of King James, whose son was at that time generally believed to be a spurious child. Though he continued to be called the Pretender, that belief had disappeared, and a legitimate heir to the House of Stuart had grown to manhood, and had friends if not sworn supporters among the most eminent British statesmen of the day. It was in the midst of such elements of peril that the moment arrived for the great trial, when it would be seen whether that fastidiously deliberate selection which the British Parliament had made of an heir to the crown from among the many distant connexions of the exiled House, was a measure having vital strength enough to bring its grand purpose to a practical conclusion. Those men must have known more than we have now the means of ascertaining, who between the Treaty of Utrecht and the death of Queen Anne believed the Hanover succession to be safe.

In Scotland, to be sure, the stage on which the last and most stirring act of the historical drama was acted, the position of matters was simple enough. There might be some dubious elements, such as the impracticability of the ultra-Presbyterians, and the uncertainty which side some Highland chiefs might take, while it was certain that whichever it might be the clan would take the same. But in its fundamental military strength Scotland was divided into two parties as thoroughly hostile to each other as

any that ever waged civil war. There were on the one side the Whigs and Presbyterians, on the other the Jacobites who were some of them Romanists, others Episcopalians, but united in a common hatred of the Whigs. It was in the very nature of things that these two hostile parties should fight it out with each other until the one was victorious and the other crushed, unless a preponderating power operating from England should settle the question at once. But there was no such preponderating power, and the war had gone on for many months before the Scottish Jacobites sensibly felt that their struggle was not to be with their fellow-countrymen alone. There were not a thousand enlisted soldiers in Scotland when the insurrection broke out; and when Argyle was sent down to quell it, he who had commanded great armies in the war of the Spanish Succession, found himself, as commander-in-chief of the forces which were to protect his own country, at the head of 1800 men. The extreme meagreness, indeed, of the military organisation for the protection of the country, or the protection of the Act of Settlement, which is perhaps the more correct expression, remains among historical mysteries. Whether, indeed, it is to the soundness of the popular feeling of England at that crisis, or to the timely audacity which prompted Somerset and Argyle to step unsummoned and unexpected into the council-chamber at Kensington, while the Queen was breathing her last,—that we owe the great result, remains in a state of almost painful doubt. One there was who doubtless looked onward to the difficulties of this epoch, exulting in the consciousness of power to conquer them. Had it not been that the pen dropped while the tale was left half told, we should have had explained to us in imperishable words the whole vital anatomy of English society and European politics in such manner as to make it plain that the whole was the result of distinct simple causes which rendered it impossible that the events should have been other than they were.

In the mean time any book which adds to our scanty information about the characters and objects of the men conspicuous in the events of that epoch deserves a welcome as an important addition to the materials of British history. It has long been known that there existed a manuscript chronicle of the insurrection of 1715, written by the Master of Sinclair; a man who, from his talent, his training as a soldier, and his territorial influence, held a conspicuous place in the councils of the Jacobites, and a command in their army. It was known that Sir Walter Scott felt a strong interest in this narrative, and that, intending to publish it, he had furnished it with an introduction and notes. Any interest, or rather curiosity, which other people might feel

about the book was not likely to be abated by the reasons which induced Sir Walter to abandon his design. He was alarmed by the sarcastic acerbity with which the Master treated his contemporaries,—a quality which, as he saw, would render the memoirs 'a precious treat to the lovers of historical scandal, should they 'ever be made public,' but which induced him to restore to its original privacy a book capable of giving much pain to living people not distantly related to the persons over whose follies and vices its author exults.

The passing away of at least one full generation since Sir Walter locked up the manuscript, while it has thrown the nearest existing representatives of the persons it commemorates into a more distant grade of relationship, has, perhaps, at the same time removed some of the relish with which the personal and political scandals might have been devoured. If there is something wearisome in a continued stream of mellifluent praise, there is something still more offensively wearisome in a continued outpouring of the bitterest gall. When the spiteful heart is so deeply devoted to its malignant work that it cannot stop to give the interest of individuality to its descriptions, and when these often apply to men of whom one knows little else than the black portrait so drawn, the exhibition is rather a dreary one to the ordinary uninterested spectator. It tells its own lesson, however, to those who take it up as historical material. The malignity with which men in the Master's position spoke of and treated each other — the scenes of depravity and meanness which in their mutual upbraidings they bring to light, form an element which should not be dropped out of our history.

Such exposures of the motives and conduct of the men who figured in the Jacobite insurrections and intrigues, when thoughtfully looked at, cannot fail to fill the mind with profound thankfulness for the better age in which we live, accompanied with a feeling of deep gratitude towards those brave and enlightened men who, in carrying out the Constitutional settlement of the Crown through all difficulties and dangers, created for us the freedom, the internal peace, and the higher political morality which we now enjoy. The notions which readers of romance derive of the singleness of purpose, disinterested devotion, and untarnished honour which must have animated the Jacobite leaders, are signally dispersed when we get among them and hear what they have to tell about each other. The revelations so obtained, if they may not be called pleasing or attractive, have a solemn interest in the significant exemplifications which they afford of the progress of political and social morality in this country. In these days, when bribery at elections and pecuniary

dishonesty in high places cause people of nervous or gloomy temperament to become desponding about the destiny of the country, it may be a wholesome and an assuring exercise to look back upon the kind of men who lived in the days of our great grandfathers, and the astounding things they did. General theories, formed abstractedly and of the mere faculties of the brain, are apt to be rudely dispersed by such facts.

Certainly a man, who takes his notions of our past condition from what he sees around him at the present day, and what he reads in the ordinary histories, would be ill prepared to believe in the scenes of treachery, cruelty, and general profligacy, political and individual, at a time so late in our annals that many people who have spoken to *him* may also have spoken to those who figured in these scenes. It can scarcely be said that either the Jacobite cause or the other is responsible for these evil characteristics, since the chief object of those endowed with them was to find the side which it would serve their own ends to belong to for the time being, and so they are at intervals generally found to have figured in both. But facts proving that there has been so great and so recent a revolution in the political morality of our upper classes, are likely to suggest doubts of the exact certainty of many well-accepted ethnological theories about the capacities and destinies of races. It may surely be safely believed that it is not in the blood of the British people to produce such miracles of atrocity as those which were developed among our Oriental fellow-subjects in the Indian mutinies. But let us not exult in too broad a line of distinction between races of British descent and the rest of the world. It was once remarked to the late Mr. Montstuart Elphinstone that it was almost impossible to realise a character like that of Lovat—externally a gentleman of rank and education, popular, genial, and bland in his manners, good-natured, accommodating, and, if anything, only too sedulous to please—while, under this exterior of genial worth, there was a conscience which by his own repeated deeds he had made that of a forger, a betrayer, a robber, a ravisher, and a murderer. The Indian statesman said he could realise and appreciate such a character perfectly from his experience of Orientals—he was well acquainted, in fact, with an Affghan chief who was almost a fac-simile of Lovat, and who always reminded him of that worthy.

Of course we must attribute the strange mental phenomena of those days to the uncertainties and difficulties of the times; and that is just the reason why a retrospect towards them must inspire us with admiring gratitude to the men whose untiring zeal and intrepidity produced, as the conclusion of their long-

continued struggle, the constitutional establishment of the House of Hanover. It might have been suspected by unprejudiced persons that a good deal of discreditable service must from time to time have been offered to the Jacobite cause. Temptations which broke through the prudence as well as the honesty of men like Godolphin, Atterbury, and 'lofty, pensive Saint 'John,' which tarnished the heroic lustre of the fame of Marlborough, were not likely to find inferior men exempt from their influence. Accordingly, when looking lower down through the grades of society, and diverging into those distant social circles to which the existing civilisation of the day had not penetrated, we find the defects and vices which sullied the great statesmen developed, according to the surrounding conditions, with greater coarseness or more reckless effrontery.

The Master of Sinclair's narrative abounds in sketches of such characteristics, by no means undercoloured. The chief hero or demon of his narrative, however—that man to whose destruction it is religiously devoted, the Earl of Mar—is not to be counted among the secondary agents. To the end of making this man odious, the Master exerts himself with an earnestness of purpose and a continuity of effort which render even his malignity a little laughable. Had he known all that the world now knows of his enemy he might have spared much of his pains, since it would be a futile task to add to the blackness of such a character. The characteristics of the leader in the insurrection derive a peculiar interest and importance from the double sphere in which he acted—in the one a Highland chief, with a troop of half-savage banditti at his heels; in the other a member of the British House of Lords—a powerful statesman, and by his connexion with the Pierpoint family admitted into a circle of politicians and wits the most brilliant and attractive of its own day, and not surpassed, if ever equalled, by any such circle in later times. His career derives, too, an additional interest by coupling it with that of his younger brother James. They worked, as will presently be seen, in totally different arenas, but it is marvellous to find how each, in his own, found abundant exercise for his extraordinary acquirements in selfishness, perfidy, and cruelty.

After some malignant private accusations, with which the world has little concern, even if they could be established, the first political crime which the Master fastens on his enemy is his advocacy of the Treaty of Union, 'the blackest and atrociousest 'of crimes,' as the Master says, 'never to be forgiven by God 'Almighty, and I think ought never to be forgiven, and im-'possible to be forgotten, by men.' It is a sad evidence of the

perverted feeling prevalent in Scotland during the last century that it should have continued to be acceptable to speak in this manner of a measure fraught with inestimable blessings to both countries, and especially honourable to Scotland as a perpetual acknowledgment of her old national independence, and her equality as a contracting party to a nation so much larger and more powerful. The extent to which Scott inherited this prejudice is curiously shown in his short but fierce comment on the story which tells how Seafield, the Chancellor, when he signed the official copy of the Act of Union, said 'There's 'an end of an auld sang.' This silly jest, which probably was never made, is solemnly characterised as 'an insult for which he 'deserved to be destroyed on the spot by his indignant country-'men.' It is still stronger evidence of such perversion that a man with so much pride of country as Scott should have maintained that on that occasion the most eminent Scottish noblemen and statesmen accepted of bribes paid down in hard cash for the votes in which they betrayed their country—Lord Marchmont getting 1,104*l.* 15*s.* 7*d.*, which was exactly adjusted by his giving back 5*d.* in copper as the balance on a shilling, while the services of poor Lord Banff were rewarded at precisely 11*l.* 2*s.*! The affair was not quite justifiable, perhaps, but it did not partake of the infamy which Scottish patriots have pertinaciously attributed to it. The finances of Scotland were then in a very irregular condition, and a number of official people were clamouring for arrears of salary. The Government thought it was not expedient to set a parliament containing many discontented and angry men to the delicate task of discussing the Treaty of Union, and at the same time the occasion was not a propitious one for levying money by taxes; they therefore requested and obtained from the English Exchequer the loan of 20,000*l.* to pay up these arrears. The application of the money was rigidly investigated by that celebrated Tory committee which ruined Marlborough and sent Walpole to the Tower; but they did not find that the payments had been misappropriated. The prejudices about the Union have died off within the present generation, and there could be little sympathy with the Master of Sinclair's denunciations had not Mar himself managed to make his conduct even about this good service odious by ignominious professions of penitence for the part he had taken, embodied in a declaration proclaiming to his countrymen that they 'should 'enjoy their ancient liberties, which were by that cursed Union 'delivered up into the hands of the English.'

Mar was at the death of Queen Anne Secretary of State for Scotland; an office which gave him enormous personal influence

from the peculiar political condition of the country. He desired to retain it, if not to improve his position, and consequently sent a dutiful letter or memorial to George I., which reached him as he passed through Holland on his way to London. 'Your Majesty,' said Mar in this document, 'shall 'ever find me as faithful and dutiful a subject as ever any of my 'family have been to the Crown; or as I have been to my late 'mistress the Queen;' and he concluded with a fervent prayer that as his Majesty's accession to the Crown had been quiet and peaceable, so might his reign be long and prosperous. Mar in the mean time endeavoured to strengthen his hands by procuring a document very characteristic of the political condition of Scotland in those days. This was an address by a large number of the chiefs of the Highland clans, authorising him to offer their entire allegiance to the new dynasty, stating that as in Queen Anne's reign, they were desirous to be led by his counsel in this as in all other things, and entreating him to commend them to the new king, and assure him of their dutiful services when needed. The younger brother, of whom we have something to relate presently, is said to have been the author and promoter of this document, to which his extensive secret channels of communication with the Highlanders enabled him to find a large body of adherents. It was calculated to make Mar appear the arbiter of the destinies of peace or war. It does not appear, however, that he got sufficient encouragement to induce him to present or make use of it, and he was enabled to assure the chiefs that their offers of allegiance were scornfully flung back in their teeth.

One evening, after having attended his last hopeless levee at St. James's, the earl set out in disguise for Scotland. He at once assumed the position of the chosen representative of the exiled Prince and announced himself as 'commander-in-chief of his 'Majesty's forces in Scotland.' It is disputed whether he produced his commission to the chiefs whom he assembled round him at Braemar, and the more charitable supposition is the negative, since any such document must have been a forgery. It was afterwards found necessay to place him in the rank and character which in his assurance he had arrogated to himself, and when the war had made some progress his veritable commission arrived. His moral nature is not responsible for having made him a wretched general, but it only too well justified the distrust of his followers, and their apprehensive feeling that they were in the hands of a man dangerous not only for his incapacity but his duplicity. In a long rancorous dispute which he had with the Master of Sinclair, his conduct looks well at a first glance, but

becomes far otherwise if we give any credit to the Master's interpretation of his motives. This latter was the leader of a party in the camp called 'the Grumblers,' who, maintaining the expedition to be hopeless, and all further efforts a mere wanton accumulation of mischief and misery, proposed to surrender to Argyle on such terms as they could obtain. Mar indignantly denounced this proposal, and called upon the leaders to stand out to the last. The Master said the cause of all this seeming magnaminity was that Mar had already been feeling for terms for himself, but found no favourable response,—was assured indeed that he would be specially excepted out of any amnesty that might be granted, — and, rightly or wrongly, this was believed to have been the motive of his conduct.

However it may have been, he took the earliest and best opportunity of escaping to France by accompanying the Prince whose arrival was so unwelcome, and who was so speedily hustled out of the country. Mar went with his master to Urbino, where the man of affairs found the business of so small and unreal a court rather too narrow for his active habits. He was charged by his fellow Jacobites with many treacheries, among others with purloining the poor 2000*l.* which at one time constituted their exchequer for political purposes. Whether all the charges against him were true it would be very difficult now to discover, and when the general blackness of his character is considered, not very important to the cause of truth. It is certain that he was in perpetual communication with Stair, Sunderland, and other British ministers,— a kind of occupation through which few characters could be sufficiently strong in rectitude to carry a man in his condition untainted. Lockhart, his rival, who bestowed on him the sort of cordial hatred which abounded in the little court of the exile, mentions a speech to Mar by their common master, which if not made in absolute trusting simplicity, which it hardly could be, shows a sense of sarcastic humour in the poor youth. He said that Mar's course of conduct met his entire approval, for by an understanding with the enemy it only gave him the better opportunity of giving effect to that zeal and attachment which he felt towards his legitimate master. Among other busy projects Mar brought under the notice of the Regent of France a plan for dismembering Britain, and subordinating England to the will of France, by establishing the exiled house in Scotland and Ireland only. No one can know the exact depth of the purposes of the treacherous, and it is therefore difficult to say whether the Jacobites were right when they maintained that Mar had been bribed by the Hanoverian

Government to promulgate this scheme for the purpose of rendering the Jacobite cause odious as that of men who would sell their country to France.

One more little incident and we have done with this man. By an arrangement founded on the professed object of securing a jointure to his wife out of his forfeited estates, the Government managed to put Mar into possession of an income of 3000*l.* a year,—as much he said, in proclaiming his gratitude, as ever he had been able to derive from his property. It happened that this act of magnanimity on the part of the Crown was set forth in the same parliamentary report in which the charges against Atterbury were stated. The Jacobites naturally had most vehement suspicions that the conjuncture was not entirely fortuitous, and that the two things were really connected with each other. Lockhart, indeed, bluntly states that it was Mar who acted the assistant detective, by playing into the hands of those put on the scent, and enabling them to trace the celebrated ciphered letters to Atterbury's door. One of these ciphered letters was intended for Mar, and when delivered to him, he was told, or he managed to know, that the cipher had been discovered, and that his answer would be intercepted and read. In that answer he put in such suggestive particulars as could not fail to point unquestionably to the Bishop, as the English leader of the correspondence,— so at least Lockhart's story goes.* Yet, after all, this man illustrates the sentiment, that there is some soul of goodness in things evil. He was fond of gardening, and did a deal to promote among his countrymen an art so valuable to their sterile land. He was a patron of the fine arts, and in one respect a very successful one, since it was he who discovered the merit of James Gibbs, the son of an obscure citizen of Aberdeen, who advancing under his countryman's patronage as an architect, has left us, among other eminent buildings, the Radcliffe Library and the beautiful church of St. Martin's in the Fields.

Mar's younger brother, James Erskine, had a very different but scarcely less remarkable career. He was a Judge of the Court of Session, and when he is mentioned by his judicial title as Lord Grange, it may possibly dawn upon the reader as a name connected with a wild tale of domestic oppression. He was the perpetrator of the outrage which has been so often referred to as 'the story of Lady Grange,'—of the woman who was seized in her house in Edinburgh and removed to a distant rock among the Hebrides, where she lived for many

* Lockhart Papers, vol. ii. p. 204.

years the life of a savage, or of one cast by shipwreck on a desolate island. Her husband led two distinct lives, nearly as remote from each other in character as the varieties of human nature exemplified within the British Isles could admit two men to be. In the one character he was a zealous Whig, devoted to the Revolution settlement, and an austere Presbyterian, erring only in the extreme rigidness of his devotional observances, and the excess of his righteous zeal against the backsliders of the time. In his other character he was a Jacobite and a profligate, mixing in scenes of sensuality with the worst men of his age. He was addicted to mysterious absences from his home and the regular haunts of his pious brethren, which might by them be attributed to any of the divine aspirations or agencies which from time to time call away men of exalted spirituality from communion with the things and people of the world. We now, however, know that on such occasions he was occupied in plots among the Jacobites, or in deep orgies of debauchery, occasionally, perhaps, attending to both duties at the same time. Wodrow, the zealous Covenanting historian, records many of Grange's precious sayings; among others, how it weighed upon his spirit to reflect that among the clergy of the day there was too much preaching up of mere morality and too little of Christ and grace. Such bold duplicity as Grange's could not entirely evade suspicion; the holy man had his enemies and backbiters, and even so simple-minded a man as Wodrow could not record his virtues and sufferings without leaving the traces of a suspicion in his own mind that possibly all might not be right. 'The man,' says the historian, 'is owned by his greatest ene-'mies to have had the greatest provocation possible, and his 'family distresses have even drawn pity from them that (I hope 'groundlessly) have loaded him with the greatest calumnies and 'reproaches. I reckon him among the greatest men in this 'time, and would fain hope the calumnies cast on him are very 'groundless; but they are exceedingly fostered and spread by 'such as dislike him for his zealous appearance for this church 'and against Mr. Simson.'*

This Simson was a professor of Divinity in Glasgow, against whom the Covenanting party of the church carried on war for several years in efforts to crush him for teaching heretical doctrines. In such a contest Grange was in his element. He could be relied on when assistance was wanted for any purpose of bigotry or persecution, and he was foremost in the efforts to withdraw all toleration from the episcopal form

* Wodrow's Analecta, vol. iv. p. 166.

of worship. We have no means of knowing how he reconciled his Jacobite colleagues to his conduct in such matters; they would probably consider, on the whole, that the odour of sanctity in which he stood towards the Covenanters was a substantial element of his value as a partisan.

When, after many years of secrecy, the history of his wife's banishment became known, his defence was that she was a woman of fierce passions and frantic temper, aggravated by habits of intoxication; that she was a scandal to him in his correct walk as a Christian man and a Judge; that she collected mobs and raised riots about his doors when he was entertaining his worshipful friends; and that he was in daily terror lest the frantic woman should rush upon him on the bench, and in that solemn place expose his domestic wretchedness to the world. Those of his pious Covenanting friends who understood that he had taken measures to free himself from his domestic curse, would believe that the righteous man had put her away privily with due attention to her comfort and well-being. His secret Jacobite colleagues, however, were well acquainted with a different solution of the mystery. Many of the most eminent among them, including Lovat, put themselves to great pains in accomplishing the lady's seclusion, both for the sake of their own safety and that of her husband. She had, in fact, discovered some of their plots, and in her frantic rage against her husband threatened to denounce him. Grange had a relation living in an old turreted mansion at the foot of the hill of Benochie, in Aberdeenshire, to whom he used to communicate, in a tortuous and misty correspondence, as much of his difficulties and sorrows as he thought it safe to put on paper. Perhaps he was not vain enough to suppose that more than a hundred years afterwards the curiosity of the world about his deeds might call these records from their obscurity, to be printed and commented on. They may now be read by any one who will undergo the tedious process for the sake of such rays of light as they throw on a life of mystery.* They show clearly that what he feared from his wife was the promulgation of criminal charges, — false charges of course, — but sufficient to inspire him with a lively terror, which exudes in allusions to Tyburn, and to the Grass Market — the place where the gibbet of Edinburgh stood.

Another female figure besides his wife occasionally flits across the misty vista of these papers. Wodrow mentions,

* Letters of Lord Grange — Miscellany of the Spalding Club, vol. iii.

among other affairs of the day worthy of commemoration, that Grange is going to London to see about my Lady Mar, his sister-in-law, who had been under mental affections, and that he is likely to bring her with him to Scotland. Doubtless the simple-minded Covenanter thought it would be a great blessing to the poor woman to take her away from her aristocratic circle in England, polluted by prelacy and Erastianism, and bring her to the hearth of a devout professor surrounded by so much sanctity. When he went to London we find him engaged in a fierce contest with a foe not to be despised, though of the softer sex—Lady Mary Wortley Montague, the sister of the Countess of Mar. Erskine abused her as heartily though not so antithetically as Pope; and of their dialogues, on her part, he gives such specimens as 'Lady Mary, 'knowing, since she first seized Lady Mar, that I would not 'let her scold on my lord and speak impertinently of him, and 'wanting, it seems, to give vent to her fury, sent for Lord 'Erskine, and told him that his father and uncle were the two 'greatest villains alive, and scolded us to him most outrageously 'for more than an hour.' And after setting forth such particulars as seemed to justify her opinion, she 'concluded with 'rage that we were both rascals, and said many other ridiculous 'things.'* The dispute between them involved questions too complicated to be here discussed, about the arrangement already referred to for virtually restoring Mar to his original income. It seems, however, that the question whether Lady Mar was sane or insane affected these pecuniary matters, and also that it was an important consideration whether her sister or her brother-in-law was to have charge of her. At all events, the possession of the poor woman was the immediate cause of the bitter contest between Grange and Lady Mary. He was so near accomplishing his object, whatever it might be, that he was on his way to Scotland, with Lady Mar in his charge, and had almost crossed the border when, to his disappointment and rage, she was taken from him under a King's Bench warrant obtained by his vigilant adversary. He mumbles forth some complaint about the injurious suspicions thrown on him on this occasion; as, for instance, that when he has his sister-in-law in Scotland he may have her secretly locked up, or removed to some distant country. Lady Wortley Montague's published letters may be searched in vain for any allusion to this curious affair. But it is evident that there has been a systematic pruning of them, since, in her correspondence with her sister, just after the

* Letters of Lord Grange, vol. iii. p. 20.

suppression of the insurrection, there is no reference to the actual or probable fate of the family; nothing to remind one that the sister to whom she writes had but recently been assured of her husband's escape from the block, or that, indeed, there was any matter of anxiety to distract the attention of either of them from fashionable news and gossip.

Grange in vain besieged Walpole for promotion: that watchful minister knew rather too much about him, having set down to his debit certain intercepted letters to the court at Urbino, and other little traces of his doings. Grange thought it excessively unreasonable that his acceptability to the zealous party in the Church of Scotland had not been estimated by the minister at its proper value. It was by no means uncommon to bring forward such testimony to the possession of spiritual gifts, as the foundation of a claim for temporal advantages. Among the sources of political influence at that time in Scotland, after large estates, or the command of a Highland following, the next element in point of power might be counted a following of the extreme Covenanters. In the present age, when little denominational prejudices and petty intolerances are scattered in various but never formidable shapes, here and there throughout Britain, it is scarcely possible to conceive the burning and exterminating zeal of those who delighted in the title of 'the persecuted remnant,' during the time when the country ran its greatest risk from the party who in politics and religion were nominally their antipodes. Nothing but a perusal of their own multifarious protests, remonstrances, testimonies, denunciations, and anathemas can afford one any conception of the remote intricacy of the theological stronghold to which they betook themselves, and the impartial denunciations which they dashed in the teeth of every one who failed or hesitated to go with them. Nor can the phenomenon be understood without looking to its cause in that dreadful persecution by the governments of the latter Stuarts, which burnt every human sympathy and all interests in common worldly virtue and well-being out of the hearts of the Covenanters. To gain men in such a condition was not difficult to the perfectly unscrupulous. Natures in such a state of spiritual exaltation are suspicious of nothing but what tends to question their belief or thwart their projects. The man who professes to go with them altogether, having no doubt or scruple, runs little chance of suspicion on their part. All of him that might seem to contradict his professions is reconciled to them by the potency of their theological logic. And if something should occur too palpably demonstrative of worldliness and vice, there is still a recourse founded upon the very pre-

ciousness of his services; for Satan, alarmed at their efficiency, has made a formidable effort and has for the time obtained the dominion over the child of grace. The possession of an influence over these men was a stake often played for by the political gamblers of the time. One of these, John Ker of Kersland, left for the benefit of posterity an elaborate and signally unblushing account of the way in which he established such an influence and the uses to which he put it.* He laid his unappreciated merit and unrequited services before the world, stating how he had established his influence, how he had betrayed the men who trusted in him to serve the Government, and with what flagrant perfidy that Government had left him unrewarded. Ker had acquired by marriage the estates of a family high in favour with the Covenanters as champions and sufferers for their cause. He thought he might inherit the religious influence of the family as well as their estates, and he expressed astonishment at the ease with which he obtained the confidence of those simple-minded zealots at no greater sacrifice than a simple avowal of conformity with their views and objects. Like a dealer setting off his wares, he describes the value of the coadjutors for which an ungrateful government would not reward him, in terms which show what sterling stuff they were made of.

'The Cameronians,' he says, 'are strictly religious, and ever act upon that principle, making the war a part of their religion and converting state policy into points of conscience. They fight as they pray, and pray as they fight, making every battle a new exercise of their faith, and believe that in such a case they are, as it were, under the banner of Christ. If they fall in battle they die at their calling as martyrs to the good cause, and believe that, in thus shedding their blood, they finish the work of their salvation. From such maxims and articles of faith the Cameronians may be slain, never conquered; great numbers of them have lost their lives, but few or none ever yielded. On the contrary, whenever they believe their duty or religion calls them to it, they are always unanimous and ready, with undaunted spirits and great vivacity of mind, to encounter hardships, attempt great enterprises, despise danger, and bravely rush on to death or victory.' †

After the accession of King William these zealots had little else to do but to rail at the Revolution settlement and at the Hanover succession, as each new event of public interest

* Memoirs of John Ker, of Kersland, in North Britain, containing his Secret Transactions and Negotiations in Scotland, England, the Court of Vienna, Hanover, and other Foreign Parts, published by himself, 1726.

† Memoirs, p. 9.

gave them an occasion for lifting up their voices. The new form of things was, they said, worse than what had gone before, in as far as, though separated from them by an impassable gulph, the monarchs and statesmen of the new order professed to be their friends. How could there be such a friendship: how could the wolf lie down with the lamb? The new sovereigns and their statesmen were uncovenanted; they had not even adopted and sworn to that preliminary article of faith binding upon all Christian men, the national covenant; and behind that there remained, as farther tests of acceptability, the Auchenshaugh testimony, and the Sanquhar declaration, along with the document so characteristically termed the 'Informatory 'vindication of a poor, wasted, misrepresented remnant of the 'suffering anti-popish, anti-prelatic, anti-erastian, anti-sectarian, 'true Presbyterian Church of Christ in Scotland.' Nor was it alone in the evasion of these salutary vows that the rottenness of the new rulers was to be found. If they had permitted the truth in some measure to reveal its glory and extinguish the previous darkness in Scotland, was it not true that in England and Ireland prelacy and Erastianism were tolerated, nay, not only tolerated, but lifted up and established in high places; all this must be extirpated, root and branch, before the Government could be admitted into Christian fellowship with the Remnant.

The clamorous perversity of these men constituted an element of hope to the Jacobites from time to time throughout the whole period from the Revolution to the affair of '45. By itself, perhaps, it would not have been worth much, but in combination with the Highland clans and the other sources of reactionary influence it would tell. But the Jacobites had far over-estimated the factiousness and folly of the coadjutors they thus sought to enlist, and when arguing came to practical conclusions, these never could be got to draw the broadsword for the old-established objects of their hatred — Popery and arbitrary power. It was hard for them sometimes to resist when the tempter who dealt with them was one of their own chosen and trusted leaders. In the first Jacobite conspiracy, which has a generic resemblance to all the others, accident saved them from the sore trial of their virtue by a trusted leader, who came to them with his temptation in the first agony of their disappointment. This affair is known as 'Montgomery's plot.' Montgomery, like Ker, took the leadership of the Covenanters as one of his hereditary rights: it is singular how in this way the feudal spirit intwined itself with the fanatical. Wodrow described his grandfather as 'a man mighty in prayer, and much 'at it, but very short at a time. He would have left company

'when in his house, frequently in a little time, and retired a little 'to his closet, as if it had been to look at a paper,—and it was 'known it was for prayer.'*

The descendant of such a man does not seem to have required many austerities on his own part to keep up the hereditary reputation so acquired. In the two handsome quarto volumes of family history—the Memorials of the Montgomeries—which contain a courtly portrait of this man and a picture of his magnificent tomb, it is said of him, 'Sir James was led into 'a correspondence with the exiled family and their adherents 'in this country, which ended in a violent display of temper on 'both sides, and at the same time embroiled him with William 'beyond hope of reconciliation.' These charitable family annalists require a few minute particulars to be added to their bland and decorous narratives if we would know history accurately. This Montgomery was so ardent a friend of the Revolution that he became one of the deputies sent by the Convention Parliament to offer the crown to King William. He had set his heart upon the office of Secretary of State for Scotland; but finding that office bestowed upon another person, his conscience suddenly became awakened to the awful conclusion that he had abandoned his loyalty and betrayed his rightful sovereign. It followed that the only method in which he could atone for his crime was to take such means as lay in his power to restore that rightful sovereign to his own. He was so fortunate as to find two other men of high station and influence—the Lords Annandale and Ross—who had been brought to the same conclusion through exactly the same process. These three organised a really formidable conspiracy for a restoration. Montgomery's contribution to the means of carrying it out was to be the zealous services of the Covenanters of the west, and, with whatever sincerity, he stipulated for certain strong conditions in favour of Presbyterianism when James should be restored through his means. There was a black leather bag fortified by each with his own peculiar seal, which contained the perilous correspondence of the conspirators. It was observed one day that there were traces in the condition of these seals of the bag having been opened without the presence of all, and some momentous documents that should have been in it were missed. This was done by Montgomery. Whether he had withdrawn the documents for the purpose of doing what he did, or became frightened into the course he took, is not clear; but he started for London with

* Analecta, vol. i. p. 272.

them in his pocket. When the absence of these documents was followed by the disappearance of Montgomery, the others instinctively knew what had happened, and they set off for London too, each his own way, and keeping his own counsel. When Montgomery appeared alone in the presence of Melville, the perplexed Secretary of State for Scotland, and hinted at the revelations he could make, and demanded terms, he was for the time an important political personage to be treated with rather than bullied; but when the two accomplices followed, and all three were anxious to be the first to make revelations, the value of treachery, according to a well-known principle of political economy, fell in the market, and the conspirators were glad to get out of Britain with their heads on their shoulders. Their contemporaries passed many reflections on the inconsiderate folly which had brought to ruin three ancient houses.

The position of the Covenanters had so many attractions for the schemers of the day, that we find even such a man as Lovat endeavouring to transact a little business in that way by affecting the companionship of clergymen, and performing a morsel of puritanism and devotion when he came southward to the low country. His character, however, was too rank, and he was too thoroughly connected with Popery to be able to carry out such designs, in his own person at least, without more trouble than the results would be worth. His strength lay in a totally different element — the absolute devotion of a Highland following. It was here far more than even in the crazy-headedness of the Covenanters that the power of the political schemers of the day is to be found. It is a common but totally erroneous supposition that the Highlanders were naturally, and by an attachment akin to patriotism, partisans of the House of Stuart. It would be strange indeed had they felt any attachment to a race who for two hundred years had continued incessantly to use every device for their extirpation. But, in reality, their allegiance was all for their patriarchal leader. Not that they carried the theory of hereditary divine right into their glens. They allowed no law of absolute hereditary succession to dictate who should be their leader, though they selected him from what might be called the royal family. Like bands of robbers, they kept the choice, in some measure, in their own hands; but having once made it, they followed their chief and captain whithersoever he chose to lead them. There occurred in the affair of the '15 a signal illustration both of the self-will of the Highlanders in giving their allegiance and their implicit obedience to him to whom it was

given. The legal proprietor of the estates inhabited by the Frasers joined the insurgents. The clan, or at least a portion of them, accompanied him provisionally until they should discover which side their chosen leader Simon Fraser, who was not then known as Lovat, would adopt. He was brought over from France at the critical juncture, and choosing, for reasons best known to himself, to take the side of the Government, his clan immediately scampered off from Mar's army, and joined their own selected chief in the Highlands.

It was an absolute necessity to these wild tribes to have leaders of some sort, and these were not always of descent so ancient and so high as the world supposes. When a clan became 'broken,' that is virtually when they had no family of position and influence to patronise them, and be responsible at court for their good conduct, they were not fastidious about the choice of a leader. The celebrated Rob Roy M'Gregor holds a reputation in the romance of history as the high-born chief of a warlike clan. Rob was in early life a farmer and a cattle-dealer, but not succeeding in these peaceful pursuits, he became bankrupt under circumstances which have rendered service to the Law of Fraudulent Bankruptcy, a division under which the name of Robert Campbell, *alias* M'Gregor, will be found reported as one of the leading cases of the Court of Session. He then 'took to 'the hill side,' as Baillie Nicol Jarvie says; and if an advertisement for his apprehension speaks the truth, he had a good deal of the money of his defrauded creditors, wherewith to start in his new occupation which in England would have been called highway robbery. He transacted a great deal of business during the affair of the '15. The state of the country was eminently favourable to his occupation, for in his marauding expeditions he held, by his own appointment, a foraging commission from either army, as he might find convenient. He and his nephew had with them a considerable body of men at Sheriffmuir, but they would not fight. Rob was in fact far too impartial to take a side; he was at the field in the way of business, expecting to find a good opportunity for plundering, which was lost by the doubtful result of the battle.

The peculiar position of the chiefs afforded easy opportunities for political profligacy, and many whose motives and rank were of a higher grade than Rob Roy's yielded to these temptations. They held, as members of the state, two totally different characters which they could play against each other at will. As no more than an ordinary subject in the eye of the law the chief professed to give his allegiance like other citizens to the sovereign, whether that of the parliamentary settlement or of his

own choice. But as a leader of men he had a separate policy to pursue with separate responsibilities, and if it suited him to desert the allegiance he professed, or to break through any promises or obligations, his conduct was not an affair of private duty or morals; it had merged into the category of diplomacy,—it was an act done in the course of a public policy, and was not to be tested by the narrow rules applicable to private life. So a brother chief, a man of education and accomplishments, speaking of Lovat with reference to his long catalogue of crimes, described him as 'one who never lost the point he had in view; whose 'surprising presence of mind in all events gave occasion for his 'seizing opportunities for succeeding in things by the ablest 'thought impracticable, and quite out of the sight of the com-'mon-rate of mankind.' Doubtless his methods of accomplishing his object were evil-spoken of by those trained to the conventional morality of the day; but 'the innumerable difficulties he 'had to conquer in the settlement of his clan and private family, 'made it necessary to cover them by means that often rendered 'his character equivocal in the eye of the world.'*

A potent chief of high name and lineage, Sir John Maclean, disturbed the Master of Sinclair's equanimity when he desired to take the votes of 'the gentlemen' of the army, by stating that *all his* clan were gentlemen, and therefore each must have a vote. This chief was connected with the project of invading Britain under the Duke of Berwick, commonly known as the Queensberry plot. The project was defeated, and Maclean being taken into custody had the disagreeable alternative before him of saving himself by a general revelation. The view he took of the matter cannot be comprehended without reference to the peculiar position of a Highland chief. 'He would tell the Earl of Nottingham,' he said, 'all he knew, upon assurance of his pardon, and being 'treated like a gentleman, so as not to be required to appear in 'public as an evidence against any person.' Such revelations as he might think it fit or necessary to make were an affair of policy and diplomacy; but for a Highland chief to be placed in the witness-box, and there cross-questioned like a common person, was degradation too intolerable to be borne.

The existence in the country of a considerable number of potentates whose conduct was regulated by so convenient a code of ethics, was always a source of danger, the full extent of which appears to have been rarely estimated by English states-

* Drummond of Bochaldy, in Memoirs of Cameron of Lochiel, p. 383.

men. When an insurrection broke out, it was of course an important question on which side each chief would 'come out,' and it was a question quite incapable of being solved by a reference to his precedents. In the '15, there was considerable anxiety and doubt about the intentions of one man in particular, the grim old lord of Breadalbane, about the most powerful chief in the Highlands. His early political career, if anything could be inferred from that, was eventful enough. He it was who got 20,000*l.* from the Revolution Government to be expended in keeping the Highlands quiet, and who became very indignant when called on to account for his disposal of the money—about as indignant as a German sovereign would have been a hundred years later, if questioned on the use he had made of a British subsidy. He it was, too, who sent his clan to slaughter the Glencoe people; an act in which he forgot that the country had made some constitutional progress since the Revolution,—that there was a free parliament in Scotland,—and that the slaughter of a few hundred mutinous freebooters was no longer a mere affair of clan with clan, in which the Imperial Government had no further concern but to give a general countenance to those who rid the country of thieves and traitors. Since that awkward affair the old chief had lived chiefly among his own clan, where he was probably more secure than any king in Europe. The Government had an eye on him when the insurrection broke out, and he was summoned to repair with other men of rank and influence to Edinburgh. He pleaded old age and infirmity as disabling him from undertaking so long a journey, but he made his appearance in Mar's camp in a dubious and unconspicuous manner, and with but a small following, as if he wished to feel his way before committing himself. The Master of Sinclair gives this sketch of his visit:—

'My Lord Breadalbane (who had engaged as soon as any to send us two battalions of 600 men each, forgot his promise for a long time, though we had refreshed his memory with sending him money to raise them; and after frequent solicitations he sent only 300 to join the clans,) came about this time to Perth, as I was told, seeking more money. His extraordinary character and dress made everybody run to see him, as if he had been a spectacle. Among others my curiosity led me. He was the merriest grave man I ever saw, and no sooner was told anybody's name than he had some pleasant thing to say to him; mocked the whole, and had a way of laughing inwardly, which was very perceptible, and that for near three-quarters of an hour I was by him. He told some of the politicians, among other things, that it was a shame to them to be idle at Perth, losing their time doing nothing, and, since they did not fight, he advised them to get a printing press, and, if they had

nothing else to say, print gazettes. He said it was inconceivable the good that printing their news would do them, and the value of those papers. They took it in earnest; and a press was sent for to Aberdeen in all haste.' (P. 186.)

Another contemporary writer sketches Breadalbane briefly thus: — 'He is cunning as a fox; wise as a serpent; but as 'slippery as an eel.' No government can trust him but where his 'private interest is in view.'*

This hoary ruffian died before the insurrection was over, and his son reigned in his stead. Of him, who bore the undignified nickname of 'Old Rag,' Sir Walter Scott gives, in a note to the Master's narrative, a sketch which we are tempted to transcribe: —

'There are curious stories of Old Rag, but chiefly such as paper will not endure. He was exceedingly hard favoured, so much so, that once upon a time when he was indisposed in an hotel in London, the landlord telling over to him the contents of his larder, the Earl suddenly withdrew his grim countenance from some folds of tartan under which he had shrouded it, and, in answer to his host's obliging offers, said, "I think I could eat a bit of *a poor man.*" What he meant was a blade-bone of mutton, called a *poor man* in Scotland, as in England it is sometimes called a poor knight of Windsor. But his face and tone frightened mine host out of the room, who never doubted that his lordship might have been in the custom of eating a tenant now and then when *chez lui.* Rag died at Holyrood in 1750. In his last paroxysm—he was upwards of ninety—the assistants held a mirror to his face to see if he yet breathed. A servant-maid held a candle to the mirror, when the dying man made so frightful a grimace, that she dropped the light on his breast. Rag exerted himself so far as to make the most singular remark that ever left the lips of a dying man. They were the last words he spoke, but pen must not transcribe them.' (P. 186.)

To firm believers in the influence of race, it must be a satisfaction to reflect that no descendants of this odious pair now inherit their honours. Sir Walter, in connexion with the extinction of their race, mentions an incident very characteristic of Highland notions. The sole male descendant of the line, the son of Lord Glenorquhy, and grandson of Old Rag, died while this worthy was yet alive; and the death was made known to the world in the usual manner. 'Old Rag was much dissatisfied, 'and damned his son Glenorquhy for his stupidity; "for," said 'he, "had he sent the boy to me, he should never have died so 'long as there was a lad bairn in Breadalbane."'

The Master treats the hero of the Massacre of Glencoe with

* Memoirs of the Secret Services of John Mackay, p. 199.

far more gentleness than the fellow rebels whose offences, whatever they may have been, have certainly been less conspicuously known. Were we to believe all that he says of these fellow rebels, it would be clear that there never had been,—at the cave of Adullam, at Bourbon's sack of Rome, or in any known assemblage of men—such a collection of unmitigated knaves, fools, cut-throats, and scoundrels in a general sense, as those who assembled round the banner of Mar. Though the author is himself always an exception of course to his own general condemnations, yet his precedents would be apt to justify the world in deeming him no better than his comrades. He was, when the insurrection broke out, a fugitive from justice, which had to deal with him in a charge of murder. He had killed two brothers—the sons of Shaw of Grenock, in single combat, as he maintained, but with indications of ferocity and malignity which carried his conduct beyond the licence of the code of honour. He was ruthless, haughty, and vindictive. His temper was of that wayward and unreasonable kind which discharges its bitterest resentment on those with whom its owner has had the closest alliance and sympathy. He has little to say against the Government and the Whigs, so entirely is he absorbed in the flagellation of his own party. Some of the bitterest of his sarcastic sallies fall on Lord Duffus, a respectable man by all accounts, who had, however, the misfortune to be the representative of a rival branch of Sinclair's own family, and thus near enough to him to be entitled to a potent share of his scorn. He thus describes the progress of Duffus northwards, on an expedition to besiege the Castle of Inverness.

'My Lord Duffus arrived, who had set out from Perth before Eckline, and, as it's usual to sea captains, liked a safe harbour and a bowl of punch better than beating the main in a storm; and like himself, without thinking of the business he was going about, providently took in quadruple, or rather more provisions of punch, in case of accidents, to carry him to the next ale-house or town, where he never failed to be several days careening, till a neap tide, which was want of liquor or want of credit, obliged him to weigh anchor and set sail for another port where credit was fresh or liquor abounding. And by this means he was ten days or more on the road more than Eckline, with, I think, two aide-de-camps and a secretary, ordered to wait of him by Mar, and himself mounted on a Galloway of thirty shillings price, though it will be found he (Duffus) had got more money from the country than might afford drink abundance and bought a very good equipage. But that and a great deal more could not quench his drouth; but I must say for his nag, though he did not promise much, when despatch was his master's business, few horses of value ran harder, and, except Seaforth's war

horse, none could keep up with him that day at the skirmish of Sheriffmuir, and he was the first at Perth. . . . I was sent to him to hasten him away, and to communicate this reform of the first scheme. I found his lordship drinking brandy in the morning with his aide-de-camp and some little people of the town. He seemed pleased with what I told him, and said he was to set out in an hour; went to take his leave of several in the town; took a morning draught with each of them before he mounted his horse to go to the Brough, whence he was to take boat to go to Seaforth. . . . Duffus went back to Elgin, as if he had been to go to Seaforth, and asked Huntly to allow him on Mar's order to take up the cess (land tax) of Elgin, for that was a very material point to him, which Huntly was positive he should not do. Ecklin did not know what to make of this procedure; and indeed no man who was a stranger to that noble lord but must have been puzzled. We all thought he might have suspended the payment of the sixteen thousand pounds for one month, till he saw further about him, without robbing the country when money was so much wanted. Huntly said he knew Duffus to be a liar all his life, but he did not think that he or any man would act so poorly and such a disingenuous part in that critical juncture; for no man who had ever heard of him could give credit to his having any money, or so great a sum. In the mean time, he had sent his secretary, David Anderson, a little rascally clerk, who he had picked up at Perth, because he used to do business for the Caithness gentlemen, and his aide-de-camp, Mr. Murray, to pave the way for him in that country.' (P. 349–53.)

The reader will perhaps feel that this specimen of the Master's method draws itself out into that sort of tedious minuteness which spiteful and scandalous narratives are apt to assume in the lips of elderly unmarried persons of the female sex. To do him justice, however, he seldom requires so much circumlocution to pronounce one of his comrades a drunkard, a coward, a liar, and a swindler; a word or two suffices for the destruction of a reputation. Lord George Murray, for instance, who was the real commander in the wonderful march to Derby thirty years afterwards, was supposed to be a man of unstained honour, but we are told that 'this was he who being sent to raise the cess 'of Dumfrieshire, kept five hundred pounds of it, which, I believe, 'was much the greater part, if not all.'

The Master's narrative tends to confirm and give a practical distinctness to some truths about the insurrection, which were previously believed in a more general and less distinct form. Among these he brings home to us the utter incapacity which prevailed in the insurgents' camp. We see in his statements more distinctly than elsewhere the great opportunity that there was for mischief, had a powerful military genius arisen to take advantage of it, and hence one naturally experiences in the

perusal, a feeling of thankfulness that the man was not found. It is only with satisfaction that the friends of the Constitution can read how: —

'We had indeed numbers of generals who were not capable to know the duty of common sentinels, and not willing to learn, and capable of nothing but lying and misleading their countrymen in action and everywhere else; except General Hamilton, who they had taken care to brand, so that nobody was to have more regard to him; and, if our army was in three times better condition than ever it had been, they must unavoidably ruin us. Better to us to have had generals of straw, as bankrupt machines, called Lords, and others who were stuffed with nothing but pride, emptyness, and ignorance, even though it had cost us the expense of maintaining them at home as we did with us; for their gratitude, when present, tended to nothing but our utter ruin.' (P. 281, 282.)

There were, however, the raw materials of a formidable army had there existed a leader capable of using them. In the first place these Lowland gentry who all wanted to be generals, had in them plenty of military ardour and hardihood, and would have made excellent subordinate officers under one who could command them. The Lowland peasantry of that day, too, were still able to handle arms; they ceased to be so during the thirty years which elapsed before the next insurrection. But the element which was most troublesome in the hands of incompetent leaders, and would have been turned to brilliant effect by a military genius, was the large body of well-armed Highlanders brought to the camp by their chiefs. The handling of such a force demanded the resources of an original warlike genius, like that of a Montrose, or a Claverhouse, a genius capable of casting aside the trammels of the conventional discipline of the day, and directing the peculiar force to the peculiar achievements for which it was eminently fitted. There was no use of drilling and parading the Highlanders. They had to be put to service such as they were, ready-made soldiers of a peculiar cast. The same promptness which enabled them to start into existence as an army at a moment's warning, also enabled them mysteriously to disappear from the camp when they disliked the service; for even when embodied they could provide for their own individual wants, and when dispersed their opportunities for self-support were naturally increased. Nothing but rapid enterprises or many opportunities for plunder could have kept them together, and the lazy listlessness of Mar's camp soon sickened them. It is evident from the Master's narrative that there was a deep latent feud between the Highlanders and the Lowland gentry of his own type, which again demanded a leader of commanding genius to keep it down. There was no oppor-

tunity for giving the many well-born gentlemen of this kind who haunted the camp commands among the Highlanders, since they would follow none but their own chiefs, even had any other officers known how to handle them. And yet, curiously enough, from the very same characteristics it follows that any general fit to command the whole must have been a stranger, at least not a Highlander. The jealousy of the clans and the chiefs towards each other, the rights of precedence demanded by some clans and denied to them by others, would have rendered it impossible for the head of any one clan to have command over the others. Hence since the days when the Lord of the Isles asserted a sort of Highland sovereignty, the Highlanders have not been known to fight effectively in combination under the banner of a Highlander; their chief exploits indeed had been performed under Montrose and Claverhouse, — Scotchmen no doubt, but on that very account all the more alienated from the Celts, who from their side were looked upon as an inferior and an odious race, whose existence was a national calamity.

In the absence of a military genius capable of combining the ill-assorted elements of the insurgent camp, there was another alternative for inspiring into them enthusiasm, and with enthusiasm unanimity. Had they found themselves embarked in the cause of a popular prince, present among them—such, for instance, as Charles Edward, who, young, good-looking, with a dash of enterprise and enthusiasm in him, put himself at the head of his followers, and made up for want of military skill by hearty good will, fair courage, and a resolution to meet the hardships of a campaign; — had such an aspirant appeared among the Jacobites of 1715, their army would have been roused from its lethargy. It was their fate, however, to suffer rather than to profit by the presence of royalty. The Master of Sinclair confirms the notion generally entertained, that the presence of the Pretender, as he was termed, had such an effect upon his troops as to cause the rapid extinction of the gradually-decreasing army. The Master speaks ever with a forced respect about 'His Majesty,' but he at the same time always mischievously couples the royal appearance with the dispersal of the troops, in a manner not to be misunderstood. The Prince was delighted to see 'the little 'kings,' as he condescendingly termed the Highland chiefs; but the delight was by no means mutual. In fact, the Highlanders in their simple notions of greatness, could never see it where physical strength and robust proportions were wanting; and the unhappy youth, feeble by nature, both in body and mind, and trained in the hotbed of a little idle court, to no nobler enter-

prises than flirting and gambling, and small intrigues, was not the man to satisfy their rude craving for strength, stature, and a grand presence. The time was winter, and in the deep snow the Highlanders dispersed to their own glens, leaving little trace of the army they had formed, and fortunately no opportunity for pursuit, and for the cruelties too apt to accompany success in civil war.

The Master has his last opportunity of dwelling on the folly, meanness, and selfishness of his comrades in describing how each of them sought his own safety in total forgetfulness to the cause to which they had professed so much devotion. It is a curious instance of self-delusion, that when we strip away the rhetorical embellishments from the facts related by him, he appears to have sought for a safe retreat only a little earlier than the others, and to have gone about his arrangements for flight with less precipitancy and miscalculation. But even in finding a hiding place he contrasts with their pusillanimous conduct his own lofty magnanimity, comparing himself to two saints in elaborating one metaphor: —

'I told my Lord Huntly,' he says, 'that the reason of my coming to him was to have a quiet refuge after being wearied to death with fighting that monster with many heads, many hands, many feet, and, which was worst of all, many tongues, which St. George's dragon was a jest to; nor could his conflict be so well proven as mine. I had struggled with as much zeal in Perth for my country as St. Paul could do for his religion with those beasts at Ephesus; and since I had gained so little ground I was glad to wash my hands of them, and retire where I could live in peace.' (P. 325.)

The perusal of such a book as this is apt to dispel from the mind of ardent youth its ordinary vision of a Jacobite hero, the ideal of chivalry, disinterested self-sacrifice, and 'ancient 'faith that knows no guile.' A thoughtful view of the picture so presented might also serve to neutralise a conviction to which men of mature years are more liable than the young — a conviction that the world is daily becoming worse and worse — that 'we are getting into an artificial state,' and that the frankness and straightforwardness which adorned the character of our ancestors a generation or two ago, are gone for ever. It is, perhaps, often the way in which we look at times of trouble — but it is peculiarly the shape in which the Jacobite insurrections have been viewed, that we have beheld them through the mellowed light of feelings arising since their extinction, instead of seeing the deeds done, and the men who did them, in the cold light of truth and historical evidence. Many things concurred to surround with a general interest and sympathy these the latest

vestiges of civil contest on the soil of Britain. The cruelties perpetrated by the Duke of Cumberland, and the commanders under him hardened in the German wars, made sympathy with the fallen cause natural to Scotland, and not uncommon in England. It was not that this sympathy palliated the guilt of rushing into war for personal or party purposes, or denied the substantial justice of the severe rule, that those who put what seems to them a just and holy cause to the arbitration of the sword, must be prepared to justify their sincerity by giving up their lives upon the scaffold should they fail of success. Granting that the leaders in these rebellions all richly deserved the doom which some of them met, it was otherwise with their poor followers. However degraded might be the condition of the poor Highlander, it was but the necessary consequence of this condition that in following his chief to battle he believed himself to be treading in the path of honour. Within the narrow code of duty and allegiance which had been imparted to him, he had gone straight forward in simple reliance. Indeed if the clansman refused to obey the call to rebellion, the state of society in the Highlands was then such as to enable the chief to coerce him; and in many instances the reluctant follower was brought to a sense of his duty by force. A considerate Government should have protected these men from the local tyranny they were under, if it were resolved that they should be responsible for their acts. But unfortunately for the fame of British rule during the early half of last century, it was not until the offence was committed and savagely avenged, that those precautions were taken which could render rebellion no longer an act of duty or submission in the poor Highlander.

After all danger from Jacobite rebellions was over, and the cruelties following Culloden were the latest remembered incidents connected with them, people began to forget the selfish ambition of the leaders in the sufferings of the humble followers, and the whole sad history was revived with a tender regret, like those green mounds over Culloden Moor, which, though they cover the bones of rebels, never fail to call up in whoever looks on them — Tory or Whig, Churchman or Dissenter — a certain sympathetic respect for the memory of those who were so faithful to their own narrow sense of duty and allegiance. When death closed over the degraded old age of him who had been the hero of Preston Pans, it pleased those in whom Jacobite tendencies lingered to find that they could, with clear consciences, transfer their allegiance to the House of Hanover. They chose, by a perfectly harmless fiction, to understand that the true heirs of the Stuarts now occupied

the throne; and to overlook the crowd of princes scattered over Europe who held their descent from Charles I. This decorous arrangement removed the last ingredient of actual political bitterness between Jacobite and Hanoverian, and left them free to treat their past quarrels as matters more of sentiment than of existing feud.

It was at the time when the old animosities had thus mellowed down, though the events connected with them were fresh in memory, that Scott burst upon the world with his brilliant romance of 'Waverley.' The social and political conditions from which he drew the charm of his story were then matters of 'sixty years since.' Nearly sixty other years have now passed since that book was written, bringing their own stock of changes, political and social. None will perhaps ever enjoy it with the eager zest of those — the contemporaries of the author — who may have spoken with fugitives from Culloden, who may have heard the incidents of the rebellion discussed at the fireside, and may have felt that the tenor of their fortunes in life had been influenced by them, and that their struggle with the world might have been less arduous had not their fathers or grandfathers been adherents of the old cause. None will read 'Waverley' with the same interest as these men did; but it is fortunate for literature, throughout all times, that the national feeling was caught up and impersonated while there was something of it yet alive to warm the sympathies of the novelist — to enlist the feelings of his heart along with the genius of his head, and thus confer on his tale such a tone of reality as the brightest genius would fail to work out by mere intellectual effort from historical narratives of past events.

ART. III.—*A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature so far as it illustrates the Primitive Religion of the Brahmans.* By MAX MÜLLER, M.A., Fellow of All Souls College and Taylorian Professor, Oxford. Second Edition, London: 1860.

TOWARDS the close of the last century great interest was excited among the scholars of Europe, by the information that the Hindus are in possession of a sacred literature which is the most ancient and authentic in the world, and which exhibits a view of the creation and government of the universe wholly subversive of the records on which Christianity was founded. This literature is embodied in a work, or series of works, collectively termed the 'Veda,' written in an old dialect of Sanskrit known to only a few of the most learned of the Brahmans—a class who at that time regarded Europeans with mixed feelings of terror and contempt, and whom no inducement whatever could prevail upon to communicate to strangers and outcasts any knowledge of their venerated scriptures.

The curiosity thus excited was naturally further stimulated by the difficulty of its gratification, and repeated efforts were made to break through the barrier, but without success; in the genuine native spirit evasion was grafted upon direct refusal, and fraud was had recourse to to appease the eagerness of the European inquirer, who was ill qualified to detect imposition. Thus Mr. Holwell, in his 'Interesting Historical Events,' published in 1766, gives a long account of what he terms the contents of the 'Chartah Bhade' and 'Aughtoorah Bhâde,' intending thereby the 'Chatwara Veda,' or four Vedas, and 'Atharah Veda,' eighteen Vedas; the latter being no Vedas at all, but the eighteen Puranas, from which the particulars he details are evidently derived through a very inaccurate medium in Persian or Hindustani. He also affirms that a translation of the Vedas existed by Baldæus, a chaplain in the service of the Dutch East-India Company, in Ceylon, in 1760: this is equally inaccurate—no such translation was ever published: in the description of Malabar and Ceylon, published by the learned chaplain, in 1762, he has a chapter on the 'Afgoderey der 'Oost Indische Heydener;' but this, like Holwell's own account, represents the mythology of the Hindus agreeably to the Puranas, modified by popular superstitions and practices. Again, Colonel Dow, in the preface to his History of Hindustan, published in 1768, prints as specimens of the Vedas a few

verses which are in reality taken from a work on rhetoric. Mr. Walker, in the preface to his translation of 'The Code of 'Gentoo Laws,' shows himself more accurately informed than his predecessors, but his information is still imperfect. 'The 'Pundits,' he says, 'who compiled the code were to a man reso-'lute in rejecting all solicitations for instruction in Sanskrit; 'and even the persuasions and influence of the Governor-Gene-'ral, Warren Hastings, were exerted in vain.'

The Brahmans, who supplied Dow with surreptitious passages from the Vedas, were not the sole manufacturers of such pious frauds, and very extensive compositions in Sanskrit were put forth in the south of India, under that designation, by the missionaries of the Propaganda, showing a wonderful amount of industry and extraordinary command of the language, but written in the style of the Puranas—not of the Vedas. They were discovered by Mr. Ellis, of the Madras Civil Service, at Pondicheri, and are described by him in the 14th volume of the 'Asiatic Researches:' amongst them was the original of a work of which a translation had been printed in Europe, in 1778, at Yverdon 'L'Ezour Vedam traduit du Sanscretan par un 'Brame.' The original had been brought from Pondicheri, and presented to Voltaire, who, transferring it to the Royal Library, expressed his belief that it was four centuries older than Alexander, and that it was the most precious gift for which the West had been ever indebted to the East;—how little he knew of the matter is evident from the work, which is an attempted refutation of Hinduism, by a Christian author.

The unsatisfactory nature of these attempts augmented the desire of European scholars to procure authentic copies of the originals, and the failure to do so suggested a doubt whether they were any longer in existence: this suspicion was dissipated by Colonel Polier, who at last procured a copy from Jayhur, through Don Pedro de Silva, the Portuguese physician of the Raja. Colonel Polier brought it to England in 1789, and presented it to Sir Joseph Bankes, by whom it was transferred to the British Museum, where it is preserved. It is a handsome MS., but is limited to the text, which without the scholia is of comparatively little use. Subsequent research, in which Sir Robert Chambers, one of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Calcutta, was pre-eminently successful, multiplied copies of portions, at least, of the Vedas, which, with other MSS. collected by him, were sold many years after his decease to the King of Prussia, and are now at Berlin. A catalogue by Professor Weber was published in 1853. As Sir Robert was not a Sanskrit scholar, he contributed no further to our knowledge

of the originals: even Sir William Jones was but little acquainted with the original text.

In the meantime Mr. Colebrooke, a member of the Bengal Civil Service, who had been diligently raising himself to that pre-eminence as a Sanskrit scholar which was eventually undisputed, engaged, amongst other pursuits, in the study of the Vedas, for which his position as a civilian at Benares and the relaxing scruples of the Brahmans offered him favourable opportunities. In 1805 appeared the first authentic analysis of the Vedas from his pen, in his essay on the Vedas, published in the eighth volume of the Asiatic Researches, conveying as copious a description of their contents as the scope and extent of his dissertation permitted, and characterised by that care and precision by which all Mr. Colebrooke's contributions to Hindu literature are distinguished. The notice was avowedly of a general nature, and the materials were in some instances admitted to be imperfect, but the result was a distinct appreciation of the character of the four works known as the Vedas, — the Rich, Yajush, Saman, and Atharvan, with specimen translations of a portion of their contents of a curious and interesting purport; the first precise information of some of their chief supplements or Brahmanas, and of their principal commentaries; arguments in proof of their authenticity, and a speculation as to the probability of their dating as early at least as the 14th century B.C. Here our knowledge was suspended, and Mr. Colebrooke's essay continued for thirty years our only authority on the subject of the Hindu Vedas. Notwithstanding the fulness and accuracy of Mr. Colebrooke's essay, it was always felt that an actual translation of the Vedas, or of their principal portions, was still wanting as the only guide upon which reliance could be placed for a comprehensive and correct appreciation of their contents; and at last, upon the institution of the Oriental Translation Fund, the late Dr. Rosen was encouraged and assisted to translate the Rig-Veda, the most important of the four. Of the eight books in which this work is arranged Dr. Rosen translated the first only into Latin; it was published in 1838 with the text in both Nagari and Roman characters. Unfortunately his premature death put a stop to the erudite and conscientious execution of his task.

The next step towards the illustration of the Vedas was made by the Oriental Translation Committee, in co-operation with that of the Translation Fund, by the publication, in 1842, of the text and translation of the Sama-Veda, by the late Rev. Mr. Stevenson, of Bombay, who had previously published at that Presidency an English version of the two first sections of

the first Ashtaka or eighth of the Rig-Veda. The Sama-Veda is short, and is a repetition or recast, for the greater part, of the Rig-Veda. It has been since reprinted, with a German translation, a copious glossary, and most laborious illustrations by Professor Benfey, of Gottingen.

For the study of the Hindu Scriptures had now been taken up in France and Germany with that intense zeal and indefatigable assiduity which characterise continental literary erudition. In 1842 M. Nève, of Louvain, a pupil of Burnouf, published his 'Etudes sur le Rig-Veda.' Professor Roth, of Tubingen, another pupil of Burnouf, who, in various communications addressed to the Oriental Society of Germany, had afforded novel and interesting information respecting Vedic literature, published in 1846 his three dissertations 'Zur Literatur und 'Geschichte der Vedas;' a publication of no great extent, but entirely new, and of the highest interest and value, and which has evidently given an electric impulse to the study of the Vedas upon the Continent, extending, although with much less intensity, to this country.

The next publication was also by Professor Roth, the text and partial explanation of the Nirukta by Yaska, an ancient commentator on passages of the Veda, and an author of a short glossary of Vedic terms. M. Nève, of Louvain, next published his 'Essai sur la Mythe des Ribhavas,' 1847, and detached hymns were published, with translations by Professor Lassen, of Bonn, and the late Eugène Burnouf, of Paris. More important works are the original texts. That of the Sama-Veda has been alluded to. Professor Weber, of Berlin, has just completed, in three large quarto volumes, the texts of the Yajur-Veda, (that portion called the White Yajush,) of the Satapatha Brahmana, and of the Sutras, or Precepts of Katyayana, both of which are illustrative of the Yajur-Veda. The text of the Atharva-Veda has been printed by Professors Roth and Whitney: the latter an American Sanskritist; and the most voluminous and important, the Rig-Veda, with an elaborate commentary by Sayana Acharya, who flourished in the 14th century of our era, is in course of publication by Professor Max Müller, of Oxford, under the authority and at the cost of the Home Government of India. Three volumes have been published; it will be completed in two, or at most in three more, and is an extraordinary specimen of diligence, acumen, and scholarship which does infinite credit both to the editor and his patrons, who have thus preserved from the risk of decay a most venerable memorial of human belief. A French translation

of the whole work from manuscript has been published by the late M. Langlois, and an English version, by Professor Wilson, proceeds *pari passu* with Professor Müller's text. Three volumes containing half the Rig-Veda, or four out of its eight Ashtakas, have been published.

Speaking of the Vedas, it is usually assumed that a collective or homogeneous work is intended; but, as above intimated, the works to which the designation is applied, are four in number, — the Rig-Veda, the Yajur-Veda, the Sama-Veda, the Atharva-Veda, each of which is a Sanhita or collection complete in itself, of detached hymns and prayers, mixed up in the Yajush with ritual directions. But these four works, constituting the mere utterance of the Vedic religion, form but a small portion of the religious literature even of the Vedic period. In addition to the Sanhitas, we have Brahmanas, Suktas, Upanishads, Pratisakhyas, Vedangas, and scholia of the most minute and profound description, all professing to spring from, and illustrate and carry into effect, the worship taught by the Vedas, a more or less extensive acquaintance with which is essential to a thorough understanding of the Veda, although it is rarely, if ever, now mastered by the Brahmans, and is manifestly beyond the reach of the European Sanskritist. Such acquirement is fortunately not indispensable to the determination of the great outline of the primitive system of religious belief inferable from the texts which are now before us, but it is no doubt of great importance to an accurate estimate of their purpose and their history. A sense of their value in these respects has induced Professor Müller to bring his immense reading and unequalled research to bear upon the subject, and has given to the public the subject of our present notice, 'A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, 'as far as it illustrates the primitive religion of the Brahmanas.'

Referring to the light which the cultivation of Sanskrit in its philological bearings has reflected upon the history of mankind, identifying, through the incontestible testimony of language, races long separated by half the globe, and diametrically opposed in complexion, constitution, laws, and religion, and pointing out the necessity of beginning with the beginning, Professor Müller observes: —

'It is with the Veda, therefore, that Indian philology ought to begin if it is to follow a natural and historical course. So great an influence has the Vedic age (the historical period to which we are justified in referring the formation of the sacred texts) exercised upon all succeeding periods of Indian history, so closely is every branch of literature connected with Vedic traditions, so deeply have

the religious and moral ideas of that primitive era taken root in the mind of the Indian nation, so minutely has almost every private and public act of Indian life been regulated by old traditionary precepts, that it is impossible to find the right point of view for judging of Indian religion, morals, and literature without a knowledge of the literary remains of the Vedic age. No one could fairly say that those men who first began to study Sanskrit, now seventy years ago, ought to have begun with reading the Veda. The difficulties connected with the study of the Veda would have made such a course utterly impossible and useless. But since the combined labours of Sanskrit scholars have now rendered the study of that language of more easy access, since the terminology of Indian grammarians and commentators, which not long ago was considered unintelligible, has become more familiar to us, and manuscripts can be more readily procured at the principal public libraries of Europe, Sanskrit philology has no longer an excuse for ignoring the Vedic age.' (P. 9, 10.)

Consistently with this view of the subject, the Vedas, as we have observed, must mean something more than a single work, and in Professor Müller's opinion 'it would be much nearer 'the truth to take Veda as a collective name for the sacred 'literature of the Vedic age, which forms, so to speak, the back 'ground of the whole Indian World.' With regard to this literature, although no doubt some has perished, yet a large proportion still remains, and until it shall have been more completely investigated, a work of very many years, it would scarcely be safe to take a comprehensive view of the whole age. Professor Müller modestly observes that what he has to offer are but Prolegomena or treatises on some preliminary questions which may be determinately answered from the materials now available to Sanskrit scholars: his principal object, he adds, is 'to 'put the antiquity of the Veda in its proper light;' meaning thereby not only the chronological distance of the Vedic age from our own, measured by the revolutions and progress of the heavenly bodies, but also and still more the distance between the intellectual, moral, and religious state of men as represented to us during the Vedic age, compared with that of other periods of history, — a distance which can be measured by the revolutions and the progress of the human mind.

After some interesting observations upon the unity of the Aryan races, and their divergence west and east at a period prior to history, Professor Müller proceeds to trace the development of the religious speculations which have given to the Hindu mind its predominant character, and have rendered them regardless or contemptuous of the ephemeral transactions which constitute political history. Adopting as a starting point the separation of Buddhism from Hinduism in the 6th century B.C., he proceeds

from thence through three periods up to that which he regards as the earliest period, describing the different classes of literature bearing upon that point. The copiousness of detail with which he elucidates the various stages is far beyond the limits of a notice like the present; and we must be content to advert briefly to the principal stages through which the Professor traces the upward ascent of the system, distinguishing them into what he terms the Chhandas, Mantra, Brahmana, and Sutra periods.

The first or Sutra period; a Sutra, literally a thread, is applied to a short and often obscure didactic rule, the peculiarities of which, as Professor Müller observes, it is not easy to explain to one who has not worked his way through the Sutras themselves: they are the groundwork of all the systems of philosophy as well as of grammar, as in the case of the Sutras of Panini, and are only intelligible by the assistance of commentators who amplify their language and expound its purport. In this place the Sutras intended are those only which are connected with the Vedas, but which do not purposely belong to the Vedic age, being included within the order of Smriti works, or those handed down by memory or tradition, and not of the Sruti or the literature of revelation, — the Mantras and Brahmanas. One great distinction is that the authors of the latter when named are said to be *seers* of the prayers and hymns — not the authors — whilst the Sutras are attributed to human authors, all of whom, according to Professor Müller, are anterior to Buddha.

Under the head of Sutras or Precepts Professor Müller classes the works called Vedangas or members, angas, of the Veda, usually enumerated as six, although perhaps on insufficient authority. We are not, however, to look for the Vedangas to those small and barren tracts which are known by this name, and which represent only the last unsuccessful attempts to bring the complicated and unintelligible doctrines of former ages into a popular form. They are Siksha, pronunciation; Chandas, metre; Vyakarana, grammar; Nirukta, explanation of words; Jyotisha, astronomy; and Kalpa, ceremonial. The first two are considered necessary for reading the Veda, the two next for understanding it, and the last two for employing it at sacrifices. Under the first division Siksha, Phonetics, or Pronunciation, comprising rules regarding letters, accents, quantity, organs of enunciation, delivery, and euphonic combinations, Professor Müller has entered into a detailed account of a class of Vedic literature first made known to us by Professor Roth, in his essay on the Literature of the Veda. This consists of works

termed Pratisakhyas, being respectively (prati) intended for the use of the branches or Sakhas of the Vedas. Every such Sakha, it is to be presumed, had its own Pratisakhya, but at present only four are known to exist, one for each Veda.

That for the Rig-Veda is considered as belonging to the Sakala Sakha; but, as Professor Müller observes, there is not a single instance of a MS. of the Rig-Veda at present known to which the rules of this Pratisakhya apply. Probably the same may be said of the other three, for the rules of the Pratisakhyas were not intended for written literature, they were only to serve as a guide in the instruction of pupils who had to learn the text of the Veda by heart and repeat it as part of their daily devotions. The text of this Pratisakhya, with a commentary, has been printed by Professor Müller, as far as the sixth book, with a German translation; and the whole has been printed and translated into French in the Journal Asiatique by M. Regnier. The Pratisakhya of the White Yajush has been edited by Professor Weber, in his Indische Studien. Such laborious minutiæ and elaborate subtleties relating to the enunciation of human speech are not to be met with in the literature of any other nation.

The standard authority for the Chhandas or metre of the Vedas is an author named Pingala, who can scarcely however be regarded as belonging to the Sutra period, nor does he confine himself to the metre of the Vedas or even of Sanskrit, giving rules also for Prakrit prosody. A very full account of his system is given by Mr. Colebrooke in the tenth volume of the Asiatic Researches. As Pingala is the authority for the prosody, so is Panini for the grammar of the Veda; but, as remarked by Professor Müller, there is an obvious inconsistency in this, for the main body of Panini's grammar relates to the post-Vedic development of the language, and the Vedic peculiarities are only occasionally specified. There were, however, many grammarians prior to Panini, as Mr. Colebrooke, in the first and only published volume of his Sanskrit grammar, remarks, and to some of them we might look for a more accurate representation of Vedic grammar if they had not perished.

The next of the Angas is termed Nirukta, and, as generally met with, is a short vocabulary of synonymous words found in the Vedas, most of which are now unused or obsolete. The author to whom it is ascribed, Yaska, has added to it two sections, in which he explains various texts of the Veda, and enters largely into the etymology of the language. The text has been published by Professor Roth, with an explanation of particular portions. The Nirukta, together with the Pratisakhyas, and Panini's grammar, supply the most interesting and

important information on the growth of grammatical science in India — a science cultivated by only two nations in antiquity, the Hindus and the Greeks, as here pointed out by Professor Müller, who has also indicated some interesting points of agreement and difference in their treatment of the subject. The following are selected from his remarks as of general interest: —

'There are only two nations in the whole history of the world which have conceived independently, and without any suggestions from others, the two sciences of Logic and Grammar, the Hindus and the Greeks. Although the Arabs and Jews, among the Semitic nations, have elaborated their own system of grammar, in accordance with the peculiar character of their language, they owe to the Greeks the broad outlines of grammatical science, and they received from Aristotle the primary impulse to a study of the categories of thought and speech. Our own grammatical terms came to us from the Greeks; and their history is curious enough, if we trace them back through the clumsy and frequently erroneous translations of the literary statesmen of Rome, to the scholars and critics of Alexandria, and finally to the early philosophers of Greece, the Stoics, Aristotle, Protagoras and Pythagoras. But it is still more instructive to compare this development of the grammatical categories in Greece with the parallel, yet quite independent, history of grammatical science in India. It is only by means of such a comparison that we can learn to understand what is organic, and what is merely accidental, in the growth of this science, and appreciate the real difficulties which had to be overcome in the classification of words and the arrangement of grammatical forms. The Greeks and Hindus started from opposite points. The Greeks began with philosophy, and endeavoured to transfer their philosophical terminology to the facts of language. The Hindus began with collecting the facts of language, and their generalisations never went beyond the external forms of speech. Thus the Hindus excel in accuracy, the Greeks in grasp. The grammar of the former has ended in a colossal pedantry; that of the latter still invigorates the mind of every rising generation throughout the civilised world.'

Again:—

'It is in the Sûtra literature that we meet with discussions on language of a purely scientific character; and what we do find in the Pratisakhya, in the Nirukta and Panini, is quite sufficient to show that at their time the science of language was not of recent origin. I can only touch upon one point. It is well known how long it took before the Greeks arrived at a complete nomenclature for the parts of speech. Plato knew only of Noun (*ὄνομα*) and Verb (*ῥῆμα*), as the two component parts of speech, and for philosophical purposes Aristotle too did not go beyond that number. It is only in discussing the rules of rhetoric that he is led to the admission of two more parts of speech, the *σύνδεσμοι* (conjunctions) and *ἄρθρα* (articles). The pro-

noun (ἀντωνυμία) does not come in before Zenodotos. and the preposition (πρόθεσις) occurs first in Aristarchos. ' In the Pratisakhya, on the contrary, we meet at once with the following exhaustive classification of the parts of speech (xii. 5.).

'The noun (nama), the verb (akhyata), the preposition (upasarga), and the particle (nipata) are called by grammarians the four classes of words. The noun is that by which we mark a being, a verb that by which we mark being; the latter is called a root (dhatu). There are twenty prepositions, and these have a meaning, if joined with nouns or verbs. The rest of the words are called particles. The verb expresses an action; the preposition defines it; the noun marks a being; particles are but expletives.' (Pp. 159–62.)

The Kalpa Sutras constitute the next division of the dependent branches of the Veda, and, as extended in their application to all precepts regulating the ceremonial observances of the Hindu which are of Vedic origin, form an extensive series of works which for practical purposes are the most important of the whole. They are distinguished into three classes, as Srauta, Grihya, and Samayacharika Sutras: the first prescribe the especial Vedic ceremonials on sacrifices, such as those to be celebrated on the days of new and full moon; the second enjoin the household or domestic rites, practised at various stages of the life of the Hindu from conception to death. The third regulate the daily observances of the twice-born; they are comparatively of little note, but the Sutras of the two first orders are of much greater moment. The Srauta ceremonials are now rarely if ever performed, but the Grihya or domestic rites are more or less regularly observed, and the prayers derived from the Vedas are still repeated at their celebration; the Vedic texts are taken from the several Vedas on which the Sutras are considered to be dependent, each Veda having its own Sutras. Professor Müller enumerates as still extant and entire three of the Black Yajush, one of the White, three of the Sama, two of the Rich, and one of the Atharva. Many more are quoted in different compositions, which are no longer procurable. The chief Sutrakaras of the Black Yajush are Apastamba, Baudhayana, Satyashadha, Hiranyakesi, and Manu, whose Sutras exist in fragments only. Katyayana is the author of the Sutras of the White Yajush. Masaka, Latyayana and Drahyayana are the authors of those of the Sama, Asvalayana and Sankhayana, of those of the Rich, and the Atharva has the Kusika Sutras. Professor Müller attributes to these Sutra an important part in the development of the Hindu religion.

The Kalpa Sutras, Professor Müller observes, mark a new period of literature and a new purpose in the literary and religious life of India. They were adopted by different schools,

and came in time to supersede the authorities on which they were founded. Professor Müller enumerates nineteen (p. 211.) works of this class as either actually existing, or quoted by different scholiasts.

The last of the Angas is the Jyotisha of the Vedas; but here also the tract or tracts that pass under this designation are brief and meagre and of little authority. They are not, however, without interest, especially in connexion with indications of a knowledge of astronomical phenomena found both in the Mantras and Brahmanas. As Professor Müller notices, notwithstanding the modern form of the Jyotisha tracts, the doctrines represent the earliest stage of Hindu astronomy, and show that the lunar mansions and the solar lunar year were part of their system.

The next subject to which the work relates is a description of the systematic indices or Anukramanis of the Veda. The most perfect of those still extant is that of the Rig-veda, attributed to Katyayana, which specifies the first words of each hymn, the number of verses, the name and family of the author, the name of the deity to whom it is addressed, and the metre of every verse. Before this there had been separate indices for each of these subjects, and it was from comprising all of them that the index of Katyayana was termed the Sarvanukrama or Universal Index. The separate indices were ascribed to Saunaka, and some of them exist at least as quotations, or, in one instance, entire. One of his peculiarities is a proof of the minuteness with which the texts were studied, a specification of the Mandalas, the Anuvakas, and the number of Suktas or hymns in each, giving 1017 of the latter. Another enumeration is that of the Vargas and verses, as 10,417 of the latter; there are other enumerations, showing some, though not a very wide difference, as 10,409, 10,616, 10,622. There is even an enumeration of all the words, reckoning them at 153,826. One advantage of these calculations is their precluding the possibility of any wide deviation from the original text. The other Vedas have also their indices, but the only authors handed down are Saunaka and his pupil Katyayana, who is the author of one of the indices of the Yajush, as well as of the Rich.

As with these works we take leave of the Sutra period, in which the authors of the different compositions, although reputed saints are mortals, and are named, we may pause to inquire how far it may be possible to ascertain the date of their existence, and so far the era of the more modern contributions to the literature of the Vedas. Saunaka is an important personage in Hindu legend, not only in connexion with the Rig-veda, but

with the Mahabharata, being one of the Rishis to whom it was related. In connexion with the Veda his immediate pupil was Asvalayana, whose Sutras we have, and from whom Katyayana derived his knowledge. We have no means of tracing the date of Saunaka and Asvalayana, except as preceding Katyayana, of whose period we have some indications, although not perhaps entitled to much reliance. But Katyayana is the reputed author of the Varttikas, additions and emendations of the grammatical Sutras of Panini, and if the same person be intended, which is more than questionable, he is the same as Vararuchi, whom Hindu tradition makes cotemporary with Nanda, the predecessor of Chandragupta, Raja of Pataliputra, — the Sandrocoptus to whom Megasthenes was sent ambassador by Seleucus. If we can trust to the tradition, then we have a final point for the date of Katyayana, the second half of the fourth century before the Christian era.

The identity of the Sandrocottus or Sandrocoptus of the Greeks, with the Chandragupta of the Hindus, first pointed out by Sir Wm. Jones, was subsequently more fully developed by Professor Wilson in his introduction to the drama of the Mudra Rakshasa, of which he is one of the principal characters. For it is not now called in question and is regarded by Professor Müller as the sheet-anchor of Indian chronology. He has entered into very copious details on the subject, not only from the classical and Hindu authorities, but those of the Jains and Buddhists, to the latter of whom Chandragupta is a person of historical interest, as the grandfather of Asoka, their great patron. There is some discrepancy as to dates between their chronology and that of the Brahmans, but not of very irreconcilable character. The dates of Buddha's Nirvana vary considerably, but are reducible to two classes. The Chinese, Tibetans, and Mongols place it ten centuries more or less B. C.; the Singhalese, Burmans, Siamese, six centuries, and this latter is most consistent with their records of the progress of the religion. Buddha's death is placed by them 543 B. C., but Professor Müller suggests that the date should rather be 477 B. C., which will explain the difference of something more than sixty years between the Buddhist and Hindu and Greek chronology; but as he observes, whatever change may have to be introduced into the earlier chronology of India, nothing will shake the date of Chandragupta; and consequently if Katyayana flourished about his time, we may consider the fourth century B. C. as the period of his Sutras and Anukramanis. Reckoning upwards from this time through his predecessors Asvalayana and Saunaka, we may reasonably prove them to have lived in the first half or the be-

ginning of the fourth century B. C.; and as there were authors of Sutras prior to Saunaka, Professor Müller proposes to extend the Sutra period to the sixth or seventh century: — prior to which we have the literature that is considered by the Hindus as constituting the periods of their inspired or scriptural Vedas.

Having assigned to the latter literature of India the upward limit of six centuries B. C., Professor Müller proceeds to examine another and confessedly more ancient class of Vedic writings, differing in style both from the Sutras which are posterior, and from the Mantras which are anterior to them. These are the Brahmanas, whose currency constitutes a distinct stage in the progress of the religious history of the Hindus.

According to the generally recognised classification of the Veda literature it comprises two great divisions, the Karma Kanda and Jnana Kanda, the practice and speculation, the ceremonial and the philosophical sections, the liturgy and theosophy, or in the language of the commentators, the Mantra and the Brahmana; meaning by the first the prayers, hymns, charms, and other formulæ to be cited or chanted at the sacrifice; by the second inquiries into the nature of man and God, and the relations of matter and spirit. The definition of the Brahmana is, however, very far from definite, and the scholiasts are driven to the conclusion that it is no otherwise to be characterised than that whatever in the Veda is not Mantra is necessarily Brahmana, a very vague and unmeaning distinction, and much too comprehensive to constitute a special characteristic. It would be difficult indeed to assign any specific attribute to the Brahmanas as we have them, the Aitareya Brahmana of the Rich, the Satapatha Brahmana of the White Yajush, which has been published by Professor Weber, and of which an analysis is given by Professor Müller, and the Gopatha Brahmana of the Atharva, also described by our author; in none of these does philosophical speculation take any prominent share; their object is usually to illustrate the ceremonial or the Mantras, by explaining their origin and import, and repeating legends illustrative of both, citing summarily the texts which are used on a particular occasion. These old stories form the most valuable portion of the sacrifice of Sunahsepha, for instance, in which his own father offers him as an immolation. As told in the Aitareya Brahmana, it is a very remarkable legend; it is translated by Professor Müller, but had been previously published by Professor Wilson in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society. Again, in the Satapatha, we have the Hindu version of the escape of Manu from the deluge. The original of the story is repeated in the Mahabharata and the

Matsya and other Puranas, and was originally translated by Sir William Jones. Many other interesting particulars occur in these Brahmanas which are of great value to both the political and religious history of the Hindus, but little or nothing to justify their character of Brahma Kanda or theosophy of the Veda.

Where then is this to be found? In works termed Aranyakas and Upanishads, which may be considered as belonging to the class of Brahmanas, and which are often found as integral portions of them, or even of the Sanhita, or collections of the Mantras, although at the same time held to be distinct. The Aranyakas are so called, according to Sayana, because they were to be read in the forest, as if they were the text-books of the anchorites, whose devotions were spiritual. Several of these have been published in the Bibliotheca Indica, especially the Brihad-aranyaka and Taittiriya-aranyaka, the former of which is also translated by Dr. Roer. The mystical philosophy of this class of literature may be seen from the translation; it is also evident that the Aranyakas, however sometimes confounded with the Brahmanas, intimate their prior existence.

A still more numerous class of works, although in some instances of rather equivocal date and authenticity, is the chief repository of Hindu speculation. These are the Upanishads, the Mysteries of Theosophy. Of these some fifty were translated into Persian by order of Dara Shakoh, and from the Persian by Anquetil du Perron, into Latin, under the title of 'Oupne-'Khat,' or 'Theosophia Indica.' The double translation makes wild work of the original, but their number is by no means complete; and besides other lists there is one by Mr. Elliot, in the Journal of the As. Soc. of Bengal, which specifies 108 works, which are known as Upanishads to the Brahmans of the south of India. Many, probably most, of them are no doubt of modern date, originating with the tenets of particular sects or individuals; those that are apparently the most ancient and authentic are the Brihad-aranyaka, Aitareya, Chhandogya, Taittiriya, Isa, Kena, Prasna, Katha, Mundaka, and Mandukya; all which have been printed in the 'Biblio-'theca Indica,' edited by Dr. Roer, who has also translated the greater number. Translations of several have been made by other hands, especially by the late Rammohun Roy, who hoped that through the Monotheism of the Upanishads he might wean his countrymen from idolatry. Although their general tendency is Monotheistic, or rather perhaps Pantheistic, yet, as Professor Müller observes, there is so much freedom and breadth of thought in them, that it is not difficult to find in them some authority

for almost any shade of philosophical opinion. Notwithstanding this vagueness, however, the Upanishads that wear an authentic aspect may be regarded as well as the Aranyakas as the Jnana kanda, or philosophical portion of the Veda, although it may be doubted if they immediately succeeded the Mantra or Karma period. They may even be regarded as subsequent in some respects to the Brahmanas, not only because they occasionally repeat or refer to their legends, but because the Brahmanas are more practical and have a more near relation to ceremonial rites, the practice of which is in all religions prior to speculation. The further history of the Brahmanas as belonging to various Charanas, schools or fraternities, adopting in preference some divisions of the original texts, is given by Professor Müller, and is followed by a list of the Gotras or Brahman families and their branches, constituting what the author calls the Brahmanic Peerage of India. Seven chief families are enumerated in one list, of whom there are forty-nine subdivisions; but there are other lists still more numerous, and Brahmans in various parts of India still profess to draw their descent from some of these ramifications. To prove that these lists were not merely arbitrary compositions, Professor Müller shows their practical bearing on two important acts of the ancient Brahmanic Society,—the common consecration of the sacrificial fires and inter-marriage.

After offering some specimens of the contents of the Brahmanas, Professor Müller proceeds to consider their probable era, and manifest and long-continued posteriority to the Mantra of proper Vedic period, every page containing the clearest proof that the spirit of the ancient Vedic poetry, and the purport of the original Vedic sacrifices, were both beyond the comprehension of the authors of the Brahmanas. There is also clear evidence that the Brahmanas are not the work of a few individuals—they represent a complete period through which the whole stream of thought poured in one channel, and was directed to the construction and development of what may be regarded as the system of Brahmanical Hinduism, but faintly if at all indicated by the original Vedic verses.

Professor Müller thinks it impossible to assign a shorter interval than two centuries for the origin and accumulation of the mass of Brahmanical literature that must have existed. We confess that we are disposed to look upon this limit as much too brief for the establishment of an elaborate ritual, for the appropriation of all spiritual authority by the Brahmans, for the distinctions of races or the institutions of caste, and for the mysticism and speculation of the Aranyakas or Upanishads: a period of five centuries would not seem to be too protracted for such a

complete remodelling of the primitive system and its wide dissemination through all those parts of India where the Brahmans have spread. There seems no reason to question the general accuracy of the lists of teachers preserved by Brahmanical tradition, and which as Professor Müller remarks would extend the limits of this age to a very considerable degree. These traditions are preserved in different supplementary works or Vansas, also regarded as Brahmanas — several of which are extant. There are several of these in the Satapatha Brahmana, which Professor Müller quotes, and he concludes that from their extent it is possible that the limit he suggests will have to be extended. We quite concur in this anticipation, and think there can be little doubt that, instead of two centuries, we may venture to conjecture four or five, and so carry the commencement of the Brahmana period to the 10th or 11th century B.C.

We now only come to what is properly the Veda — the Mantra period of Professor Müller — the collections of prayers, hymns, formulæ, ritual injunctions, charms — which have been brought together in the Sanhitas or collections of the four Vedas. The Hindus themselves are content to look upon the fourth as of an equivocal character, and usually speak of the Vedas as three.

Setting this aside then, we should have for the scriptural Vedas the remaining three; but here also a very important distinction is to be made, and the Yajush and the Saman are to be regarded as long subsequent to the Rich, originating in a different object and possessing different characteristics connected evidently with the development of the ritual, and approaching, through intervals of greater or less extent, to the period of the Brahmanas.

The Yajur-veda is two-fold — the Taittiriya or Black Yajush, and the Vajasaneyi or White, originating, no doubt, with a schism of which Yajnavalkya was the probable author. Both these forms indicate their subservience to an established ceremonial; they are liturgies and rubrics interspersing short injunctions of a ritual purport, which are given in prose with verses to be repeated at the ceremony, many of which are the same that occur in the Rig-veda, from which they are in all probability derived.

In the course of time it had become the practice to accompany part of the sacrifice by songs, and hence arose the third or Sama-veda, of which the verses are to be chanted: a very large portion of its contents are the same as the hymns of the Rich, and perhaps the whole might be identified if we had the whole of the early Sakhas.

It is then to the Rig-veda Sanhita that we must look for the most authentic and primitive representation of the Hindu religious belief. We must not, however, lose sight for a moment of the meaning of the term Sanhita or collections. The Rig-veda Sanhita is not a work of one author or of one purport; it is a mere bringing together of a number of metrical compositions, varying in authorship, intention, and date, generally of a religious character but not always, and although offering occasional intimations of ceremonial and priestly worship, yet possessing nothing of a decidedly liturgical character, or direct applicability to either Srauta or Grihya rites. The verses may be employed and are employed at such rites, and they were also recited at sacrifices in praise of the deities to whom any particular act of sacrifice was addressed, usually by priests, termed the Hotri, in a loud and distinct tone, and with due regard to the rules of euphony, any deviation from which vitiated the ceremony. Here, therefore, we have evidence that there was a ceremonial in existence when some at least of the hymns of the Rich were composed; and even rites of a somewhat sacred character, as the Darsa-purnamasau, or sacrifices at the new and full moon, and the whole array of priests, sixteen in number, are alluded to. But these allusions are incidental and transitory; they show that some of the hymns must have been preceded by rudiments of a liturgical ceremony, yet many others have not the slightest reference to anything beyond the simple adoration, by the presentation of butter or some juice to the deities, who are the objects of the praise or prayer. The different issues of the Suktas, so often mentioned by themselves as being old or new, will allow for the gradual evolution of liturgicial rites emerging evidently into the rubrics of the Yajush and the chaunts of the Sama. On this subject Professor Müller observes: —

'We may, therefore, safely ascribe the collection of the Rig-veda, or, as Professor Roth calls it, the historical Veda, to a less practical age than that of the Brahmana period; to an age, not entirely free from the trammels of a ceremonial, yet not completely enslaved by a system of mere formalities; to an age no longer creative and impulsive, yet not without some power of upholding the traditions of a past that spoke to a later generation of men through the very poems which they were collecting with so much zeal and accuracy.'

Professor Müller conceives nevertheless that there is some priestly influence distinguishable in the Sanhita of the Rig-veda, as exemplified by its classification into Mandalas or Circles, of which seven are attributable to as many different Rishis and their descendants. There may have been such

collections in use by different Gotras; but, to say the fact, some of those persons to whom they are ascribed are of a rather equivocal character, and the compiler of the whole Sanhita may have adopted the distinction as handed down by tradition without caring to be very exact as to detail. The question is not of much moment; the priority and posteriority of the Suktas relatively being unquestioned, they are undoubtedly of very various, possibly of very distant, eras, and we know too little of the chronology of the Rishis, their reputed Seers, to base the date of the composition upon that of the author. The Suktas of the Rig-veda had run through a long course of years, possibly centuries, before they were brought together in one general collection. The business of collection must have occupied some considerable time,—according to Professor Müller, two centuries; but we know too little of the process of reducing the scattered Mantras into a collective form, to be able to assign any fixed period to it. It is uniformly ascribed to Krishna Dvaipayana, surnamed Vyasa the arranger, assisted by a number of reputed sages, intending possibly a school or series of schools in which the Sanhitas of the Vedas were brought into their present shape during an interval of the duration supposed, or about two centuries, bringing the compilation, agreeably to an amended compendium, to the 12th or 13th century before the Christian era.

In what state did the several hymns circulate when they were first brought together? Had they been current orally alone, or in writing, and, if the former, were they reduced to writing when they were collected? That the Mantras were for a long time, perhaps for ages, current orally, there can be little reason to doubt. The pains taken to secure their accurate enunciation, and the elliptical style of their composition, are evidences of oral transmission. The question, as stated by Professor Müller, is, was the collection of the ten books of Vedic hymns the work of persons cognisant of the art of writing; were the thousand and seventeen hymns of the Rig-veda, after they were gathered into one body, preserved by memory or on paper? Professor Müller answers these questions by an interesting excursus on the probable period when the art of writing was first known to the Hindus, and draws the inference that before the time of Panini, and before the first spreading of Buddhism in India, writing for literary purposes was not in use. The chief ground for this inference is the absence of any word not only in the hymns, but even in the grammatical lectures of Panini, which presupposes the existence of writing, whilst in the ancient works of a people like the Jews, to whom writing must

have been known from of old, such words as writing, scripture, book, volume, are of constant recurrence. Nothing of this kind occurs in any Sanskrit works older than Manu and the Mahabharata. At the same time Professor Müller admits that the Hindus were acquainted with the art of writing before the time of Alexander, and the expressions *likhita* and *likhapita*, written, and caused to be written, occur on the inscriptions of Priyadarsi, which are no doubt of the third century B. C., and therefore, as far as is yet known, of Panini's date, cotemporary with him, or even older; consequently, no argument can be drawn from his omissions or phraseology against a knowledge of the art of writing in his time. The question is not without its difficulties. That the Suktas could be handed down from generation to generation by memory alone we need not hesitate to admit, but if they had not been committed to writing when they were collected and classified into *adhyayas* and *mandalas*, the task of compiling and perpetuating would have been but imperfectly accomplished, if some more durable condition had not been impressed upon the collection than that of being entrusted to the memory alone.

To the Mantra period Professor Müller adds one still earlier, to which he gives the appellation of Chhandas,—the metrical or poetical period; understanding thereby the time at which those hymns or mantras were composed, which may be regarded as of most archaic character, emanating from the first religious sentiments of a simple people, and preceding the institution of a ceremonial, or the organisation of a priesthood. It seems scarcely necessary to make this a distinct era; it is the same as the Mantra period, in which we have seen a wider space is evidently required for the new, intermediate, and ancient hymns which are recognised by the authors of the hymns themselves, especially as Professor Müller thinks it essential to caution against too hasty conclusions as to the comparative recent date of many hymns, in which sentiments worthy of the most advanced ceremonial, or the presence of philosophical ideas, are to be found; there being, as he observes, very little to guide us in forming a judgment of what is genuine and primitive in the ancient poetry of so peculiar a race as that of the Aryans in India. In this want therefore of a safe criterion we may be content to look upon the Mantra period as one complete in itself, though extending over a long space of time, and in some instances to a very remote antiquity. At the same time even that is not the most distant term to which we may trace the literature of the Vedas; for, as Professor Müller remarks, ages must have passed before the grammatical texture of the Vedic Sanskrit could

have assumed the consistency and regularity which it exhibits. Throughout, every tense, every mood, every number and person, of the verb is fixed, and all the terminations of the cases are formally established.

'From this point of view the Vedic language and poetry may be ascribed to a modern or secondary period in the history of the world, if only it be understood that what preceded that period in India, or in any other part of the Aryan world, is lost to us beyond the hope of recovery, and that, therefore, to us the Veda represents the most ancient chapter in the history of the human intellect. We find no traces in the Veda, or in any Aryan work, of a growing language, growing in the sense in which some of the Turanian languages may be said to be still growing at the present day. The whole grammatical mechanism is finished, the most complicated forms are sanctioned, and the only changes of which the Aryan speech, arrived at the point where we find it in the Veda, admits, are those of gradual decay and recomposition.'

Having come to this conclusion that we have in the hymns of the Rig-veda some of the oldest records in the history of man, we may now inquire what was the condition of society which it discloses, and more especially what was the religion of the people? How far it afforded the sanction which the Hindus affirm of it to the religion that has prevailed for at least twenty centuries in Hindustan?

'The Veda,' says Professor Müller, 'has a two-fold interest: it belongs to the history of the world and to the history of India. In the history of the world the Veda fills a gap which no literary work in any other language could fill. It carries us back to times of which we have no records anywhere, and gives us the very words of a generation of men, of whom otherwise we could form but the vaguest estimate by means of conjectures and inferences. As long as man continues to take an interest in the history of his race, and as long as we collect in libraries and museums the relics of former ages, the first place in that long row of books which contains the records of the Aryan branch of mankind, will belong for ever to the *Rig-veda*.'

'It has pleased some of the most enthusiastic cultivators of the literature of the Vedas, amongst whom our author must be distinguished, to imagine a state of Indian society of a pure, simple, and patriarchal description, in which the feeding of flocks and herds was the main occupation of life, and whose chief recreation was the adoration of the deified elements or the composition of those songs in their honour which constitute a large portion of the actual collection.

'There was a time when the poet was the leader, the king, and priest of his family or tribe, when his songs and sayings were listened

to in anxious silence and with implicit faith, when his prayers were repeated by crowds who looked up to their kings and priests, their leaders and judges, as men better, nobler, wiser than the rest, as beings nearer to the gods in proportion as they were raised above the common level of mankind. These men themselves living a life of perfect freedom, speaking a language not yet broken by literary usage, and thinking thoughts unfettered as yet by traditional chains, were at once teachers, lawgivers, poets, and priests. There is no very deep wisdom in their teaching, their laws are simple, their poetry shows no very high flights of fancy, and their religion might be told in a few words. But what there is of their language, poetry, and religion has a charm which no other period of Indian literature possesses: it is spontaneous, original, and truthful.'

For all this there seems to us to be but little warrant in any of the hymns, and the general tenor of them leaves no doubt that at the date of their composition society had assumed a more artificial character, and that the people were not encamped on the borders of rivers, or spacious Havanas, but were collected in hamlets and towns, and that their leaders were neither poets nor patriarchs, but princes whose favour and munificence were sought for and bestowed upon priests and poets. No doubt the principalities were of small political power, but they were independent and constantly at variance with one another, although their contests partook more of a predatory than a national hostility. It is also clear that a considerable portion of India was occupied by races not only of a different character and creed, but actively inimical to the practices of the Hindus, with whom the latter were in a normal state of antagonism. The subjugation or the servitude of these races must have been the work of time. Professor Müller has not entered upon this subject, but confines his attention to the religious condition which the Vedas exhibit as existing at the various periods throughout which the hymns may be traced.

The first and most obvious conclusion to be drawn from the hymns of the Veda, whatever may be their relative antiquity, whether twenty or twelve centuries B.C., is that the religion which they inculcate is not that of the Hindus of the present day. The Brahman who, from the time of the code of Manu as we have it, had arrogated to himself the attributes of a god upon earth, is in the Veda only one of seven, or even of sixteen priests, acting as a sort of master of the ceremonies, but not invested with any superior rank or authority. Of the distinction of caste at all the indications are faint and uncertain, with one exception — that of a remarkable hymn in the 10th Mandala, the tenor and style of which place it indisputably in a comparatively recent stage, and bring it at least to the Brah-

manic period, by which time we know that the Brahmanical system had been organised. There is no mention of temples nor of public worship; the ceremonial is entirely domestic, and so far the formulæ, the language of the Suktas, still constitute the liturgy of the domestic rites of the Hindus. It is very doubtful if images were known, although mention of personal peculiarities, as of the handsome jaws of Indra, might be suggested by a sculptured representation of him. Something else may, however, be meant; but the great feature of difference is the total absence of the divinities, both nomina and numina, who have for ages engaged, and, to a great degree, engrossed, the adoration of the Hindus. We have no indications of a Triad, the creative, preserving, and destroying power; Brahma does not appear as a deity, and Vishnu, although named, has nothing in common with the Vishnu of the Puranas; no allusion occurs to his Avataras. His manifestation as Krishna, the favourite divinity of the lower classes, for some centuries at least, does not appear. As a divinity Siva is not named, nor is his type the Linga ever adverted to. Durgá and her triumphs, and *Kali*, whom the 'blood of man delights a thousand years,' have no place whatever in the hymns of the Vedas. These differences are palpable, and so far from the Vedas being the basis of the existing system, they completely overturn it. It would be an interesting subject of inquiry to discover when, and by what means, the vast mass of the modern mythology of the Hindus sprang into existence and attained its circulation throughout India.

What then was the religion of the Vedic Hindus, as exhibited in the Suktas? Recollecting that these are most probably of widely different dates, and that they were collected and put together without much, if any, regard to system, we cannot expect to find a coherent and systematic form of worship or belief: each Sukta must be taken by itself, expressing its own notions. By far the greater portion of them are addressed to the personified elements, especially to Agni or Fire, as represented in three phases, in heaven as the sun, in mid-air as lightning and meteoric phenomena, and on earth in the ordinary elementary type. Indra, the atmosphere, is the next in importance, especially as the sender of rain and consequent fertility, and to these two perhaps half the Suktas are addressed. Connected with them are the sun, the two divinities termed Asvins and the Dawn, and Indra and Varuna; and the Visvadevas, or universal deities, may, without much violence, be brought within the same category. These deities are eulogised and magnified, and they are implored for food, cattle, progeny,

safety, long life, and all worldly enjoyments. Varuna especially appears to be the punisher of crime, and his protection against wickedness is frequently implored. Indra is, in an especial degree, the god of battles and giver of victory, but his attributes and the legend relating to him are not unfrequently ascribed to other divinities, as to the Asvins and to Agni. A prominent and rather unintelligible object of praise and prayer is the Soma plant, a sort of asclepias, the bruised leaves and stems of which yield a juice, which by standing ferments into an intoxicating liquor, which is supposed to gratify the gods and animate them to extraordinary exploits. That this beverage was partaken of by the assistants can alone explain their elevation of it to the rank of a deity, and can have originated only in a stage of semi-barbarism, such as we can imagine might have won the adoration of the American Indians when first acquainted with ardent spirits. In hymns, too, which are apparently of an early date, we have the details of the Scythian sacrifice of the horse; and there are indications of the occasional offering of human victims, although of rare and special occurrence. As a general rule, however, the offerings are of an innocent description — the Soma juice, clarified butter, and cakes of barley or other grain fried with butter and poured upon the fire. The same is presented to all the gods alike, and in this, as in other respects, there is so much in common that all the Vedic divinities may be resolved into one, as a general type of one universal being.

What indications do we find of a future existence or a system of rewards and punishments? The Vedic Hindus recognised unreservedly the difference between a material and spiritual state of being, and looked to the survival of the soul, and its occupation of an incorruptible body amongst the Pitris or Manes. There is no detail as to their condition, nor have we any positive intimation of punishment of sin after death, beyond deprecating its consequences during life, and the designation of Yama as judge of the dead. It was also part of the Vedic creed that holy men, as in the case of the *Ribhus*, might attain the condition of gods. These intimations, however, are incidental and vague, and all that we can positively conclude from them is that the Vedas recognised, after the dissolution of the body, the life of the soul which animated it, and its continued existence in some heavenly sphere. There is no very distinct reference to the metempsychosis; none whatever to the fact of transmigration; an omission the more worthy of notice that it is the foundation of all the philosophical systems of the Hindus, and consequently proves their being posterior to the Vedas.

Had the Vedas any knowledge of one almighty and all-

wise Creator and Ruler of the universe? They had a belief in such a Being, although evidently not unmingled with uncertainty and doubt. Professor Müller has given us a very remarkable Sukta, in which a state of things before creation is clearly apprehended, the course of creation summarily sketched, and the question stated, Who knows what is the truth? There are several passages of this kind in the Suktas, but to some of which at least very reasonable suspicions of a later age attach, being of the nature of the mysterious, which is manifested in the Upanishads. We are much disposed to look upon several of those cited by Professor Müller as open to this objection, and to think that in his enthusiasm he has been led to give a value to expressions which is more exalted than they deserve. Thus, for instance, in the hymn above alluded to, and which has been gracefully put into metre by a friend, we have the following passage: —

> 'Darkness there was; and all at first was veiled
> In gloom profound—an ocean without light;
> The germ that still lay covered in the husk
> Burst forth, one nature from the fervent heat;
> Then first came Love upon it.'

Now the term 'love' here appears to us to convey a notion too transcendental to have had a place in the conception of the original author. The word is *kama*, which scarcely indicates love in the sense in which it may here be understood, although not absolutely indefensible; but *kama* means desire, wish; and it expresses here the wish, synonymous with the will, of the sole existing Being to create. It is a familiar Vedic phrase in speaking of the time before creation, to say 'THAT, the one 'Being, was alone. He said,—May I be many!—then sprang 'the world into existence.' It is the wish, or rather the will, therefore, of God that the world should come into existence that the passage is speaking of, and not any such emotion as is ordinarily understood by 'love.' At any rate, this hymn and various others, particularly two in the tenth Mandala, hymns 81, 82, addressed to Visvakarma, the Omnificent, establish beyond controversy that the Vedic cosmogony was that of none of the subsequent schools; neither asserting with the Sankhyas the coeternity of matter and spirit, nor with the Vedantas the existence of spirit alone. However dim the knowledge, however vacillating the opinion, it is evident that the authors of the old hymns of the Veda were disposed to believe in the primary existence of one God when nought else existed, and that the world was created by his fiat, and organised by his wisdom and might.

These are the conclusions to which a careful consideration of the contents of the textual portion of the Vedas, the Sanhitas,

reasonably leads; and it is unnecessary to point out how important they are, not only to the history of the Hindu religion, but to that of the religion of the ancient world, at an era prior to any of which we possess a written word, with the exception of the Pentateuch. Students of ancient history and religion will feel greatly indebted to the erudition and laborious research of Professor Müller. It is not possible, in a brief survey like the present, to render justice to a work, every page of which teems with information that no other scholar ever has, or could have, placed before the public; and although many of the details are likely to interest those only who delight to explore the dark paths of antiquity, and to trace the progress of human opinion and belief, yet the work must ever hold a foremost place, not only in the history of India, but in that of the human race.

*** Although it is contrary to the usages of this journal to disclose the names of its contributors, we are tempted by peculiar circumstances to depart from this salutary rule on the present occasion. We are indebted to the late Boden Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford, Professor Horace Hayman Wilson, for this Essay. It was his last work, completed within a few hours of the event which terminated his useful and honourable life. We feel a melancholy satisfaction in thus publishing this posthumous testimonial of the first Sanskrit scholar of the age to the erudition and worth of the most eminent of his followers, destined, we trust, ere long to become his successor in the chair he adorned.

ART. IV.—1. *Hugonis Grotii De Jure Belli et Pacis libri tres. Accompanied by an Abridged Translation.* By WILLIAM WHEWELL, D.D. 3 vols. Cambridge: 1859.

2. *Commentaries upon International Law.* By ROBERT PHILLIMORE, Doctor of Laws. 3 vols. published. 8vo. London: 1859.

THE British public are obliged to Dr. Whewell for giving them occasion to refresh their acquaintance with the great mother work of International Law. The service is moreover opportune to the times. The system of alliances, whether Holy or otherwise, to which for a generation back we have been wont to look as the public law of Europe, is shaken and destroyed. The balance of the Powers trembles violently and variously. The policy of nations changes sides from day to day, with the moral indifference of pieces on a chess-board. Religion is arrayed against liberty and nationality, and the enormous armaments of almost all civilised nations prove that they are again compelled to rely on force rather than on law for the defence of their rights and the preservation of their independence.

Amid this chaos of all landmarks whether sacred or social, one is tempted to ask, What is our boasted civilisation? Where is that mental progress which we so loudly claim as the prerogative of man and the legacy of history? Have heroes lived, martyrs died, sages thought, sciences marched, but to leave us after all to the arbitrament of force, or of a policy as headless, as heartless, and still more fickle? Where, then, are those laws of universal and changeless rectitude, which philosophers discourse of for two thousand years back, and whose seed, though it might fall for a time upon the rock, could not fail to find a soil wherein to strike its roots the deeper, in proportion as human reason was developed to receive them? Is it the fact, and not a national incompetence of comprehension, that permitted an Italian jurisconsult, Lampredi, and after him a British professor, Dugald Stewart, to say, with relation to Grotius and his subject, that 'the same ideas are constantly returning in an eternal 'circle . . . while in the meantime the science of natural 'jurisprudence never advances a single step; but notwith-'standing its recent birth, seems already sunk into a state of 'dotage?' Is this noblest of the structures of social reason a child's cardhouse, to be overthrown with each whim or ebullition of the several governments, and thus humanity be left the Sisyphus of justice as well as happiness?

To persons disposed to reflections of this tenor on the actual condition of European nations, the natural resort is the writers on the subject. Among these writers, Grotius may still be ranked the principal. Not of course for the selectness or application of his doctrines; but for the sources and the discussions, which are more useful to general readers. This distinction is observable, whatsoever the subject. There is something in the founder which is never superseded by any reproduction or improvement of followers. Originality instructs us by its very defects. Beside the matter in hand, it presents a counter-impress of the circumjacent mass from which the fragment was detached; whereas the fragment forms the whole stock in trade of the disciples. To these, the insulated essay is the sole object visible; and hence an inverse tendency to take it for the whole, or at least for the centre and soul of the subject. They fancy their own planet into the solar position. They raise the author to a god in hopes of passing for his high priests. They disguise through vanity, they darken by illustration, they dislocate by method, they weaken by improvement. These parasitical productions then, though practically the more useful, can never with the student or the careful reader replace the original. And this proportional importance is attested by nature; which for one creative intellect, spawns a thousand mediocrities, fully capable of commenting and even enlarging things once created.

Who that comprehends, for instance, Aristotle's philosophy, can recognise the master in even the best of his expositors? Who can estimate the fragmentary Organon of Bacon, so well from all the glosses of Scotch professors and flippant essayists, as from the simple perusal of those profound yet precise apophthegms, which grasp and gather in the meaning with admirable prehensibility, and which stamp along the page a set of characters so significant, that, like the leaf-prints or the foot-prints in fossil deposits, they lure imagination back into the scenes of vanished worlds. Indeed Bacon is perhaps the best example in all history of the perpetual value of the original writer. He proposes to reform the world in the science of method, by a book which is itself without a semblance of any; and yet few readers will account him presumptuous or incompetent. What he teaches you *positively* does not come to much, and most of even that is in substance not original; yet by his manner of selecting and expressing those detached thoughts, and especially of extracting them from the vitals of decayed learning, he seems as if exhibiting but mere samples of his treasures; he has the mystic air of an Oriental conjuror, supposed to hold the

keys to so many caves of knowledge; he excites the imagination and through it amplifies the intellect, in the endeavour to explore the positive complement of his criticism. Some degree of this power of suggestion and solemnity of expression enhances likewise the work of Grotius on International Law.

But this is not enough for the inquiries above supposed. It bears upon the accidents of author, age or work, more than on the proper essence of public jurisprudence. There is perhaps not a doctrine or opinion in Grotius that had not been presented by some anterior writer; the real innovation was the grand conglomeration, or rather the new principle, that prompted and permitted it. Unless, then, we know the existence of this principle, and have besides some means by which to test its truth to nature, the book is practically of no use to us towards solving the perplexities or soothing the anxieties suggested in the opening paragraph. Without a scale there is no determining the juridical authority, the scientific character, or psychologic import. But with it, all those traits may be assigned, not alone to Grotius, but to all other writers on the subject.

This criterion no commentator of the work of Grotius has hitherto supplied, or attempted to supply. Dr. Whewell, who is the latest, does not even see the need of it. He praises and defends with the usual generalities, and afterwards confines himself to his 'selective' version. The selection consists in omitting the quotations, which form, it is known, a large proportion of the text, and here and there inserting explanatory phrases. The utility of this gutting of the Dutch plethora is doubtful, and so the execution is hardly worth examining. The version, however, as far as we have looked through it, does not appear remarkable for elegance, or even accuracy. For example, a maxim of Cicero is rendered, 'There are duties even '*against* (*adversus*) those who have injured us.' But more gravely reprehensible are the explanatory phrases, which sometimes make a systematic change in the meaning. This, however, of course through prepossessions of doctrine, not from any incompleteness of acquaintance with the Latin idiom. Dr. Whewell's praises are also maladroit. 'Solid philosophic prin-'ciples,' 'orderly distribution,' and even 'exact definition' are not the forte of Grotius; but an editor may be excused the license of his calling. Dr. Phillimore, in his still later and independent publication, reiterates, without a like excuse, the vague eulogies, while he has not a syllable or even a surmise of characterisation, as will be seen hereafter. So that up to the latest date, *the place and value of Grotius, as an authority in the Law of Nations, remains quite undetermined.*

Indeed, *so* undetermined that writers of distinction, such for instance as Dugald Stewart, and before him Jean Jacques Rousseau, have denied the work of Grotius all scientific value. Mr. Hallam, in his vindication from the diatribe of Stewart, is also driven to that last refuge of advocacy, known among logicians as the argument *ad verecundiam*. Instead of proving his client's merits, he preaches modesty to the accuser. With some consciousness of the weakness, he returns to the task, in a subsequent division of his work.* But here, too, the answer is still no other than a slight analysis of the treatise itself: 'So 'that the reader, having seen for himself what it is, may not 'stand in need of any arguments or testimony to refute those 'who have represented it as it is not.' This naïve reply of course evaded the objections. The public may be brought to see that one thing is not another, and yet be no whit the wiser as to the essence of either; but this essence was the veritable question at bottom. Still further was the answer from touching Stewart's criticisms; which, seeing nothing of this true question, turned mainly on the adjuncts of uncouthness of manner, and the lack of originality. The analysis of course excluded wholly the former, and only wrapt the latter in greater perplexity. The inference must be, then, that even Mr. Hallam, with all his various learning and his critical experience, failed to discover and point out in the work of Grotius those qualities which most effectually vindicate its fame.

Sir James Mackintosh had preceded him in a like strain. He is indeed not extravagant, but only rhetorical. What he says of the learning and virtue of Grotius was never called in question, and might therefore look like surplusage. The plea, that his citations are *always* made to support principles, is far from being fully true, and were it otherwise, would not excuse citation to excess. It would only aggravate it, on the contrary. For multiplied quotation, while a virtue in induction, where a principle or law is to be gathered from such cases, must, in the inverse process, be impertinent in argument, and weaken the law by multiplicity of illustration. Grotius, it is true, confounds habitually the two procedures, we mean the illustration and the induction. But it is odd that the distinction or the existence of the latter element, on which in fact is based the main principle of his system, should not have been detected by men so anxious for his fame, and withal such adepts in the Baconian logic. Mackintosh, however, remarks of the quotations, that such sentiments as they contain 'are the materials

* Lit. of Europe, vol. ii. p. 545, 4th ed.

'out of which the science of morality has been formed;'* but he does not say, by Grotius. And moreover, if this has been the natural order, what becomes of the defence with which the apology commenced, of first appealing to some principle to control the citations?

It may be owned that the vast popularity of Grotius was at the outset due, in fact, to adventitious circumstances. Chief among these appear to us to be the following: There was, first, a profusion and variety of classic learning, which had its highest attraction at this noon of the Revival. Then, the multitude were taken by the religious spirit, and the copious citations from the Bible and the Fathers. Further, the universities in all the Reformed countries adopted the book of Grotius, from opposition to the Canonists. Another circumstance was his assertion of the prerogative of kings; a class who were in reality the chief agents of the Reformation, and so would favour an authority that sanctioned the autonomy which the great event alluded to had given to the minor Princes of Germany. But the universal element of academical success in the work was the casuistic character of both the argument and illustration. But these advantages, although they have buoyed up the work of Grotius, have never upheld this or any other, beyond the day. The persistence of that work, then—for it does, we see, persist, in spite of powerful assailants and seasons of oblivion—directs us for its cause to something deeper in the subject. And to this we now venture to address a few remarks, which, as they must be succinct, we shall seek to render methodical.

In fact, to give the results some completeness and conclusiveness, we must attempt a sketch of the history of the Law of Nations, as resolved into its principles, or as they say in France, *raisonnée*. If in the course of this inquiry the latent import of the work of Grotius, with the occasion of its defects and other characters, should be evolved, there is no sort of human evidence so satisfactory or even so popular. It is essentially of the nature of that by which a Leverrier, from the concert of two or three laws, or of one law in two or three positions, commands the instant and absolute assent of all mankind to the existence of a new planet, with all its elements of time, mass, distance. Nay, the chances of aberration in the simple subject of astronomy would be incalculably greater than in the system of social history.

* Int. Law of Nature and Nations, p. 25.

This history, as that of all human operations, has taken its commencement from the agency of the gods. Men could mould their infant governments as they could measure their planet, but by looking away from the earth to the stars. As the father gave the law to the first community of the Family, so by an easy extension, the community of the State, or of an aggregate of states, continued long to derive it from a similarly abstract and thus a divine father. Accordingly the term *Jus* was derived by some of the ancients, rather fancifully than philologically, from Zeus, meaning that the Supreme Deity was the fountain, and even the fact, of universal law. The procession is repeated in the kindred term *religion*; which means bond, not of union, as is commonly pretended, but a mere individual obligation — *res ligans*. The term obligation itself is quite synonymous. Both the notions are extensions of paternal dominion and of filial obedience from the family to the society. The father, whether natural or preternatural, was the master, from whom the children individually must receive law as they did life. He is thus a living rule by which their differences are adjusted, their conduct directed, their interests equalised. This was the primordial, and must still be the historical, conception of *Jus*, which means spontaneous or natural law. There was no notion of those 'rights,' by which the word is mistranslated, nor of even obligation directly between the citizens, but simply of a common concentration of obedience and a reciprocal irradiation of will and weal from the divinity. It is the primary plan of nature in all her stages of organisation, as in the ray-fishes, in the lichens, and back even to the crystals.

Such was then the primary and positive law of justice *within* each single family, tribe, city, or nation; and such is also the reason why it must have been a religion. This character, in fact, remains in all the maxims of antique law. A Greek equivalent for the appellative of fellow-citizens was ἐνσπόνδοι, or people making vows or sacrifices to the same divinity. When criminals were punished it was not for example, nor even for atonement, but as offerings to the gods; a sentiment explaining the famous usage of the ancient Gauls. It explains also an observation of Aristotle upon riper states, that they had no criminal laws, but left the citizens to right themselves. For laws of this class suppose the notion of cross relations between the citizens, and refer also to exceptions, which are provided for but later. The spontaneous, the regular, and religious jurisprudence lay in oracles and divination, declaring the divine will. It was a *secret* of the priests or the patricians, and thus *sacred*, and its forms were the *acta legitima* among the Romans.

Even in the rudimental international relations, first conceived by the Greek states, the religious character was paramount. These conventions were reducible to one or other of the three articles, of sepulture, sacrifice, or sanctuary; and it is curious that, with a slight variation of designation, they concur with the foundations assigned by Viço to the Social state, although deduced by this Italian, not from Greek, but from Roman history. This philosopher has laid down marriage instead of sanctuary or asylum. But the asylum was to the outcast what the family is to the young, and both of them were nurseries successively of the State. It was by means of asylums that cities were first founded, as witness the conspicuous example of Rome itself. The very council of the Amphictyons, the tribunal of the laws in question among the Greek communities, arose from an asylum. Its jurisdiction was accordingly almost entirely religious, extending but to cases of the categories specified. It viewed the leagued states but as votaries of Apollo: scarce at all as social bodies, political or federal. In fine, the philosophers themselves of the same nation, wherever they admitted the existence of a law of justice, continued to the last to connect it with theology, Aristotle being alone to hint the source of the 'common good.'

The Romans, who succeeded, did but generalise the Deity, in proportion to the greater extent of their dominions. The philosophic Cicero was wont to say to Atticus, that he must decline arguing with him upon jurisprudence, unless he conceded the existence of a Providence. This premiss was his 'something 'eternal that rules the universe, a wisdom of commanding and of 'forbidding, peculiar to the immutable law of God.' So the often recited and eloquent description, preserved for this allusion by the piety of Lactantius, is based on the condition of a 'master 'and an emperor of all things, the Deity.' So, down to the greatest and the latest days of the Roman law, the Deity was its source, with the mere *alias* of the name *nature*. Thus the *jus naturæ* has been defined by Ulpian to be 'that which 'Nature has taught to all animals' (omnia animalia); a modification imported from the Stoic philosophy, which contributed so much in all things to rationalise this jurisprudence. It was from the same source that the Roman *jus gentium* came likewise to be viewed as the dictate of 'common reason'; thus excluding recognition of all human enactment. For the Reason of the Stoics was not an attribute of personality, but a conformity to Nature, and through nature to God. It may, however, be remarked as a co-operative incident, that though the *jus gentium* began with *Roman* reason, or consisted in the uniformity imposed on multifarious usages in practical adjudication

between foreigners at Rome, yet that this passive and purely objective point of view of the arbiters had, of itself, a tendency to general equity, and largely, though spontaneously, reacted on the national laws, with which it came in this way to be finally embodied; thus submerging or 'ponding,' with the expanse of a noble lake, the rather crooked and covert rivulets in which it trickled from the Twelve Tables. This, in fact, is the true account of that preeminence of Roman law which is vulgarly ascribed to special qualities in the nation. It was a result of the place and of the part of this nation at a critical point in the career of social progress, as could be fully demonstrated were this the occasion. What we are here to note is, that the notion of this reason, as of that of the Stoic, in their identity with ideal justice, was founded, not in man or morality, but on nature; was a result of coincidence, not a bond of community; was centripetal in obligation and positive in form; was theological in source and territorial in circumscription.

This, we say, was the progressive understanding of the law of *nature* throughout the ancient world, within the several social unions.

But from union to union of family, city, nation, and even among the classes in the latter aggregations, there succeeded step by step another species of *jus* or law, disruptive of the former, centrifugal in tendency, — in short, the law of discord and contention termed Right. It is correlative and contrary to duty or obligation (which composed the law of nature) and is the germ of the Law of *Nations*. By observing this broad distinction we may dispense with the 'between,' about which writers have descanted as if it were some deep discovery. It was easier indeed to make the distinction in the name than to find it in the thing, which now discloses so well the reason. But yet this contrast between the Law of Nature and the Law of Nations left the source of both the systems to continue long the same; and the reason of this also is obvious from the premisses. For though the idea of rights was a reaction or revolt against the rule of physical nature represented by tradition, there could long have been imagined, to be substituted for the divine sanction, no new authority on the human side, as embracing the whole scheme of society. For paradoxical though it may seem, the march of rights as of liberty has been downwards from the state to the individuals, not the contrary. Thus the general divinity would have been slidden down from the presidence of nature to the patronage of each nation, without regard to or even consciousness of the self-contradictions in which they thus were placing him, both by their change and their diversity. This

precisely is the sense in which the *jus gentium* was opposed by the Roman law to the *jus naturale;* a right belonging to *nations*, and not a right *between* them. For the individual nations could not think to back their rights by appealing to a sanction which was shared by the adversary. They could but oppose to it a counter divine right, adopting the old divinity, or inventing a new one, as their champion. And so it followed that the law of Nations, like that of Nature, was long divine; a strife of gentilitial gods who absorbed each other gradually, till all were swept away by the advent of the Christian religion; which, as Tertullian said, made 'Romanity' a sort of synonym with Humanity.

Let us briefly trace through history this secondary stratum of the ancient jurisprudence, in its mode and degree; for the degree is everything in these investigations, and the neglect of it the cause of most of the crudity on the subject.

As in the primary jurisprudence all was settled by authority, the response of the god through the augur or the oracle, so in the extra-national or negative phase of justice, the arbiter at first must, of necessity, be force or war. The Deity there was Father, he is here an Avenger. Hence the continual warfare of these primitive communities, their reprisals, their duels vicariously for the whole army, of which the combat of the Horatii and Curiatii was an instance. For all this was considered as a sort of trial of justice, which must, for want of law, be decided by force. The law of nature was yet but religion even in the interior of each state, and the holy hatred of the hostile creeds suppressed all thought of it beyond. We saw that even among fellow-citizens, as testified by Aristotle, there were no laws in these communities for the suppression of crime; and for the reason that crime is an exceptional event, and thus a thing for which a regular provision was not conceivable; how much more natural was therefore such an absence among States? For as the criminal department of the municipal law is in reality a species of war against the wicked, so warfare was the criminal law among nations. This explains, for example, why the council of the Amphictyons looked on quietly while the confederates made war on one another, and could only interfere against a foreign invader. So in each of these Grecian cities, though united against an enemy, the oligarchies were accustomed, we are told by Aristotle, to swear eternal hatred and hostility to the plebeians; for this arose from want of a common law of justice, made impossible by difference of religion, or gods and rites. Niebuhr compares the struggle of these classes at Rome to a warfare of ages between two distinct nations. It was, however, in this

highest or international expansion that the ancient law of nations took its primary character, as painted in the well-known formula of the *pium purumque bellum*.

Thus hostility was at each step the first medium of intercourse between these several bodies, whether classes or communities. Hence in Latin the same word announced an enemy and a stranger. For the true reason was, that the things were identical; and not, as some explain, because the Romans were inhospitable, nor, as said by Cicero, because they were humane, and would mollify by metaphor the character of enemy. There was no derivation from either to the other; the name was given both of them simultaneously, because but one. Another inference is that warfare was a secondary state, and not the primordial, as imagined by Hobbes. The remark was made by Plato, who derived *πολεμός* from *πολίς*, and concluded that the warfare was posterior to the city. But equally opposed is the preceding exposition to those who speak of war as at all times 'unnatural.' It, on the contrary, was a natural because the necessary means of throwing together those primitive nuclei of social humanity. For the first tendency of all organic bodies whatever is to preserve their own integrity, and to this end repel each other; and as these tendencies are mutual, it was equally necessary that they came into collision and that force should decide. It is thus in fact that war was the basis of the Law of Nations, as was empirically noted by Hermogenianus (who by the way is quite misapprehended by Grotius), the rude substruction of right which they still sink to in the last resort, until the progress of the edifice shall have submerged it for ever. The highest point to this effect which was attained by antiquity is found in the *Jus Feciale* of the Romans. And yet this institution has still the various characters assigned to the incipient condition of the Law of Nations. It was religious in character, its functionaries being styled priests, their corporation a college, and itself, in short, a religion. In substance, it consisted not of principles or rules, but like the war it dealt with, in simple operation. With the usual fidelity of Latin etymology, this fact is represented in the name *Feciale;* which, being from *faciendo*, meant a law that lies in action, in contradistinction from the passive law of *Jus*. An example is the mode in which these functionaries declared war, by *casting* a spear into the enemy's territory.

It may be further noted that, in this stage of Institution, the Law of Nations adhered to the parent state alone. The *Jus Feciale* was no more international than our own Foreign Office might be termed European. The Fecial College, like the Foreign

Office, was a place for transacting, not the common affairs of nations, but Roman business with relation to them. It supposed no reciprocity, which alone constitutes a law-proper, and no such institution existed in fact elsewhere. In due conformity to this condition, we shall find the Law of Nations advancing, towards the close of the period in question, to a purer expression than the Roman *Feciality*; and doing so, like all beginnings, by occasion, not institution. But first, let us pass inwards to the strife of the classes, and note how far the law advanced within these narrower limits. Thus alone can we keep a due gauge of the progression. And this guidance is not only indispensable to steer us through the cleavage of those delicate historical laminations; it is also important as a proof and a pattern of what we should expect to find repeated, on a larger scale, in the Christian or modern period, to which we come presently: for nature has but the same plan from first to last.

In the more compact condition, then, of classes of the same community, this negative law of resistance, Right, and War took form earlier: for as the positive advances downwards from the whole to the parts, so the negative advances upwards from the parts to the whole. It was embodied in a sort of Bill of Rights, consigned to language, of which the Twelve Tables are a notable example. The divine legislator of the Hebrews employed also this expedient, in the venerable constitution now known as the Ten Commandments. Hence it is that most of the articles in both those charters were *negative*, that is to say inhibitive, belonging to *criminal* law. They were the famous FORMULÆ *actionis* of the Romans, in opposition to their ACTA *legitima* of the religious law. But even as civic justice could be conceived at first but in the coarse material shape of those ceremonial acts, of which the Fecial office too retained, we saw, the character, so the advance before us went scarce beyond the words. There was no consideration, no conception of equity; the law was in the language, and in nothing beyond. Shylock is nowhere more a Hebrew of the Hebrews than when he insists upon the physical letter: 'I cannot *see* it; 'tis not in the 'bond.' A maxim of the Roman Jurisprudence to the last was, *Dura lex, sed lex.* It was a comment on the primitive law, the Twelve Tables, *uti* LINGUÂ *nuncupassit ita jus esto.* The rule was strictly adhered to in all the long interval. The *qui cadit in literâ, causâ cadit*, was never a dead letter in these ancient communities. At the noon of the Republic, all the eloquence of Crassus (the Demosthenes of Rome, as even Cicero could style him) was tasked to wrest the benefit of a law for the Plebeians, because this

class was not contemplated in the 'form of action;' and Cicero himself expended one of his greatest efforts in rescuing an estate from the flaw of a single letter. Though undermined progressively since the age of Cicero by the equity or judge-made law of the Prætor, these formulæ were fully and finally abolished but by a decree of the Emperor Constantine, who ordered, in the Christian spirit, that equity alone should rule. We beg attention to this fact, as decisive of the limits within which the Law of Nations was conceived in the Heathen period; as proving that it rested to the last on the ground of language, this semi-physical intermediary between Nature and Humanity.

This *religio verborum*, which was thus the jurisprudence of classes disunited by the religion of common sacrifices, came in time to be extended to extra-national *relations*. It is the origin of treaties, by which regular war was terminated, and at Rome it fell of course into the Fecial jurisdiction. We must therefore look elsewhere for the higher advance alluded to. This in fact is found in the incipient combinations of certain states of Greece, for the purpose of self-protection — thus advancing from the termination of war to its *prevention*. The notion is the dawn of a balance of powers, but was conceived in principle only by minds like Demosthenes. Moreover, at the best, it is still a state of warfare or tacit hostility, as the term well implies; a conflict of forces, not a concert of principles. Its office is to give the Law of Nations a rude skeleton, beneath whose shelter the civilising and subtler agencies of mind and commerce should promote the social intercourse and thus the equity of mankind.

Hume, in his Essay on the Balance of Power, remarks it as strange that, notwithstanding the Greek commencements, the Romans had been suffered to conquer the world and Greece itself included, without forming or encountering a single instance of these balances. But there, with his habitual facility, he leaves the difficulty. In truth, the fact is one of the most pregnant in history, and the course of these remarks conducts spontaneously to the cause. The Romans represented a third phase of public justice, which was destined to combine, to the end of harmonising, authority and liberty, obedience and rights, religion and warfare, the law of Nature and the law of Nations. Accordingly this statement characterises their whole history. It accounts for the confusion so much noted in their law of the *jus naturale* and the *jus gentium*, as for the rudimental view they had of both; their combination of patrician authority with democracy; their religious scrupulosity and their reckless inhu-

manity; their perpetuity of warfare with their professions of peace. For it is known that with the Romans the end declared in all their conquests was the 'pacification' of the barbarian world. And such was undoubtedly their conscious intention. The Romans really warred to put down warfare. And as a consequence of this mission, they both avoided, themselves, the formation of balances which by their strain keep up the spirit, and anticipated the resort to them by any of their enemies. And the expedient by which they quite instinctively effected both, was the harmonising process of synthesis now explained, as the opposite of the antagonistic law of balances, and which is known familiarly as their system of *alliances*. But notwithstanding the singularity of bestowing this soothing title on the victims of conquest, and often of plunder and oppression, the Romans could but sketch this supreme form of the law of justice, while a moiety of their own people was moreover kept in slavery. They thus were nearly destitute of the great element of humanity, and principally wrought on the co-factor of physical nature. Upon this basis, through the vast and varied expanse of their empire, their juridical inductions attained a noble generality. But they remained without the spirit, the soul, the moral element, which it has been the glory of Christianity to introduce, and the advent of which forms a new epoch in our subject.

This epoch consisted in the passage of the ground of laws from physical nature and divinity to spiritual nature and humanity, or investing the Divinity with human affections. The view must here, in turn, be one-sided, like the former, against which it is in fact but the general revolt: for it is by oscillation between opposite excesses that the intellect as well as conduct are brought to settle towards the line of rectitude. Meanwhile, upon this human foundation of justice, there must also be a repetition of the three stages above delineated, which are really but the modes of all methodical procedure. Their character in the new order, with relation to the source of justice, may therefore be respectively assigned in the correlatives of, Faith instead of sacrifice, Opinion instead of force, and the interests of Civilisation instead of mere 'pacification.' For the latter was but despotism, while civilisation is peace *with* progress.

The first of these periods, or that of Authority, was represented by the Church of Rome. The priests were the Fathers, the patricians of the heathen epoch; but spiritual, like the obedience which was paid them by the name of Faith. The Pope was the oracle inspired by the Divinity, the Conclave of

Cardinals was but the Fecial College; the Councils, a mode of their Amphictyonic namesake, made itinerant to meet the vast extension of the jurisdiction; in fine, the Canon Law was the International jurisprudence. It is precisely what Bartolus, with a true Italian sympathy, distinguished as the *Jus gentis* FIDELIS. It threw into neglect the Roman law proper, or left it but to draggle on its territorial ground. The Canon Law, or law of Faith, was the code of authority, not only between sovereigns, but even socially. It materially affected, if it did not embrace, all the relations of man, and may be said in one sense to have engendered the Feudal system itself.

Accordingly, men finally revolted against it, and thus became the authors of a second jurisprudence, which might be termed moral or human by pre-eminence. As in the former system all things descended from above, from the catholic summit of European society, so all, in the reaction, must spring from below, from the individual conscience and its popular concurrence. This tendency of ages came at last to an issue in the grand democratic revolution of the Reformation. Democratic, that is, in the spiritual or moral sense; for politically, the effect was long confined to the sovereigns, of whom it liberated several hundreds from their homage to the German Empire — an empire also assuming to be Holy and Roman. Then expanded the conception of International Law, which had been smothered in the aggregation of the previous despotism: for the Canon and the Civil Laws were as commixed in Christian Rome, as had been the *Jus gentium* and *Jus naturæ* in the Pagan. Another result of the liberation was the disorders, wars, balances with all of which the reader has a sufficient acquaintance to perceive in them the primitive condition of the Greek communities, repeated on a vaster scale, and through the principle of Opinion. For this passage of the motive from plunder or conquest to religious opinion was the character assigned the epoch. The ancients had never waged a war really religious, and could not have even conceived it: a proof is the fact of their pretended toleration, which sceptics have invidiously contrasted with the intolerance of Christians. What they called 'pious and holy' war was war conducted in due form, or according to the ritual of their *acta legitima.* On the contrary, in the modern religious wars, what was sought was the triumph of a creed, an opinion: the force was a mere instrument, recurred to for want of a better, in awaiting the development of principles to back the sentiments. It is a body of such principles, the dictates of the common conscience,—not the dogmas of Theology nor the abstractions of Natural Justice,—that was to constitute the second

Christian stage of public law, and which might perhaps be distinguished as the Moral Law of Nations.

In fine, as this Individual source of law or Right would, if left to run its course, end in destroying all society, just as the divine Rights of Kings and Clergy suppressed all liberty, there must arise a third system to harmonise the conflict, in some analogy to what was seen in the Alliance system of the Romans. The entrance on this form brings us up to the present-times, and of which we may return to say something before closing. For the moment we will but add what good readers must have anticipated, that even this stage cannot conduct the Law of Nations to perfection. This great subject, like all others, must proceed through a third circuit, intermediate to the opposite and extreme views of Man and Nature; where, by excluding their excesses and combining their contributions, it will gain the universal and fully rational state called Science. This, however, we may leave to the care of the remote future, and merely note it to show in full the actual bearings of the subject. The Law, in this last period, would be Social or scientific—as it might, in the Christian society which we move in, be called Political, and in the primitive or Heathen, the national or Theocratic.

Such is, through its whole career, the briefest sketch of the Law of Nations that seemed at all consistent with distinct characterisation. Let us now, with still more brevity, examine if the authors who have advanced the science be conformable to this programme. They will thus have been defined by their mere place along the scale, until we come to meet with Grotius, the main object of inquiry.

The first or Heathen period produced no writer on the Law of Nations, and for the best of reasons,—that no such law was known. The reason might scarce hold, indeed, of modern times, when people have the faculty of writing without knowledge. But they do so through the past accumulation of materials, and a confusion that conceals ignorance from the public, and even themselves. The ancient situation was with both entirely opposite. There were comparatively few writers, and the readers were select, and the subjects must be drawn, not from the bookshelf, but from nature. There the subject sought the author, not the author the subject. But the merely pragmatical commencements of the Law of Nations which we have, by the light of the later developments, been able to retrace through Græco-Roman civilisation, were not yet prominent enough to press themselves upon contemporary intellect. Ac-

cordingly Aristotle, who encyclopedized the epoch, never really attained to the idea of this law. The supposition that he had written on it rested on the verbal error of πολεμων for πολεων — or wars for cities; in the title of his lost treatise on political constitutions. The work referred to was, in fact, the highest conception of the ancient world—a comparative anatomy of all the politics then known. But the point of contemplation was political or national. The various constitutions were conceived as organisms which might indeed concur, like fish and man in fin and hand, but had, no more than these two creatures, any objective law of community. Cicero, who aped him as a summist of Roman politics, could never even here transcend the same Greek limits; all his periods about natural and rational law or justice revolve on mere *concurrence*, and never reach *connexion*.

And the reason of this curious mental impotence is now plain. It was above seen that the ancient point of view of social bodies was from without inwards, or what we called centripetal. The effort was to win men from the wild of barbarism, and shut them in from all communication with those beyond. Hence the City, which in those times meant what is now named the State, was habitually commenced with the wall of enclosure: and so essential seemed this wall that it passed by synecdoche in both the classic languages, to signify the city. In our own day, in the wilds of Australia and America, the settlement commences with a surrounding fence; it is only long after that the individual settlements, or the villages they grow to, turn their attention outward, and think of making roads to join the different and distant groups. Yet the men in this predicament possess the idea of roads, whereas the primitive pioneers had to grope their way for ages of war and mutual plunder, till commerce taught the use of them: these roads give a rude image of International laws. In fine, the nature that works in this form through primitive man, commences all her organisms on just the same plan. The embryonic matter of the animal or plant is first enclosed by a membrane, as is familiar in the egg. Of this the use is not alone to protect from things external, but chiefly to supply to the internal fermentation a circumambient fulcrum to keep it in due position. Nay, the parts of this interior organism are formed separately; they are seen to throw out gradually threads or filaments to each other, and, finally, cohere into the shape of the body natural, precisely as delineated in the embryo of the body social. This analogy explains, moreover, the absence of Criminal law in the ancient communities, while the Political was

so elaborate. The latter is the mere shell and husk of society; the former interpenetrates the body of the organism; it supervenes on the constitution, as the protective complement that keeps the embryonic elements from mere congestion, and adjusts them to the flexibility which combines unity and freedom. And as the Law of Nations was shown to be the same, but elevated from the parts of a single state to a group of several, we may conceive how fully normal is the absence of ancient writers. The ancient statesmen and philosophers might therefore be contemplated as placed upon those insulated segments of the social embryo, each working towards the centre of his own civic system, and brought in contact with other states but by the consequence of expansion. The writings of Plato are a study in this light, where he labours to envelope his model Republic with all the tortuous fences of mystic numbers and geometry, without a thought of other States, unless to shut them off more surely. But eyes or intellects however powerful, cannot see where they are not looking, and especially when looking in the opposite direction.

The Christian epoch, then, supplies the earliest writers on the Law of Nations. They were, in the first or theological division, the Canonists and Casuists, of which Aquinas was an example. These were succeeded by the great Italian Jurists, who rose with the universities of Bologna, Pisa, and Florence. Both revivals were a consequence of the establishment of the Free Cities, and the secularisation of the principles of government, recalling the Civil law into ascendance above the Canon. But the Roman law had little that was really International, and even that little was already quite amalgamated with the Civil. Accordingly, these rude Professors wrote nothing on the Law of Nations. As knowing any law in those days, they were chosen for ambassadors; which is, by the way, what obtained them so much consequence: but the rules of their official conduct were from the Civil Law. And even in this, their immense treatises were utterly without method. The writers, for the most part, were interpreters, or glossists. They were properly enough comprised in the class of artists—understanding by this term the useful, not the fine—in the cataloguing of the trades throughout the Italian cities: for the Italians, like their ancestors, viewed all things as art or trade. The sole Italian writer of those times on the Law of Nations was Albericus Gentilis, who belongs as much to England; and who, moreover, when he passes from the precincts of the Roman law, gives but a mere ritual of what his predecessors practised. His work might have been compiled from the records of the Fecial College; although Grotius, with some *finesse*, parades acknowledgments to his

'diligence,' while he never mentions Suarez, from whom he derived something different.

The lineal successors of the Canonists on International subjects, are the Spaniards Victoria, Vasquez, Soto, and others; and in the practical order, Balthazar Ayala, whose treatise led the way for the Italian just mentioned. In fact, Spain was the great conquering power of that epoch, and consequently the most merged in international relations; a concurrence which suggests the influence of history upon intellect. This priority of the Spaniards upon the Law of Nations is, with his usual candour, recognised by Mr. Hallam, who says that 'Spain 'appears to have been the country in which the subject was 'originally [first] discussed upon principles broader than pre-'cedents:' he does not mean that 'precedents' are principles, but only grounds from which they are evolved.

These Spaniards, as a class, may be distinguished by the name Scholastic. Dialectics and construction are their features of originality. They show a tendency, by these bands, to combine the two epochs of Heathen philosophy and of Christian legislation, the *Jus naturæ* of the Stoics, and the *Jus canonicum* of the Catholics. By this conjunction they transcend all predecessors of either order. Take, for instance, Dominic Soto's definition of Law, in his treatise entitled *De Justitia et Jure:* 'Law is a certain *ordinance* and prescription of *reason*, pro-'mulged for the *common good*, by the power that governs the 'State.' *Lex est quædam rationis ordinatio et præceptio in commune bonum, ab eo qui curam reipublicæ gerit, promulgata.* Thus, then, here is an 'ordinance,' a systematical arrangement, and not a mere enactment, as commonly accounted. It is an ordinance of 'reason,' and not of volition. It is prescribed, not, as with Blackstone, by a 'superior to inferiors,' which would scarcely include the Demos of Athens, Paris, or America, but by the power which governs, whatever that may be. And the law must, in fine, be for the 'common good.' And so fully and firmly was all this conceived, that the author expounds, in the true scholastic fashion, and to the purport indicated, every term of the definition with exhaustive completeness, yet a conciseness truly admirable. For instance, on the article of reason and will he has a special chapter, bearing this title:—*Utrum lex intellectûs sit, an voluntatis, actus?* Whether law be an act of intellect or of volition? The decision is triumphantly for intellect or reason. The will can originate, he shows, but single acts; whereas law is essentially a permanent relation, and in case of that of Nations, lying in nature itself. We may add, as a worthy practical comment on this noble doctrine, that this

great ecclesiastic of the sixteenth century, all Spaniard though he was and monk to boot, declared against his own countrymen in favour of the Indians, and this on the ground of their international or natural equality.

The Spanish school of Jurists attained its climax in a Jesuit, the admirable Suarez, in his treatise 'On Laws.' Nothing, for that age or any age upon the subject, can compare with the large and luminous arrangement of this work. It is a species of Alhambra in logical architecture. The fundamental principles are also still as noted. The Greek philosophers, and, far above them all, Aristotle, are constantly cited — not for testimony but authority — side by side with the Canonists, the Fathers, the Gospel. God, indeed, is made the source and the sanction of all law. But yet the law of nature is independent of his will. He cannot alter it, because he cannot contradict himself. The author, however, adds a quibble, to save the miracles, for want of noting the distinction established by Soto between intellect and will, although he formally confirms it. For will cannot possibly be self-contradictory, as being composed of insulated incoherent acts, of which each is independent, and the latest always paramount. Self-contradiction implies reason, that is to say, a rule. Suarez, who subscribes to this, is guilty then of subterfuge. He reasserts the doctrine respecting the human conscience, which is also but a particular mode of volition. It can do nothing, he insists, to affect the Law of Nature (lib. ii. 9.), including, we must suppose, the moral department. Here is the conclusion philosophically logical, which has made Spain the stronghold of the Holy Inquisition. For the right of will or conscience is the right of contradiction — contradiction of all authority, including its own.

This right of independence or individuality, in opposition to the right of collectivity or catholicity, is the Reform which found its issue and its organ in the German nations. It is the deeper moral side of the religious revolution. From religion the new principle advanced forthwith to Public law. Some two or three writers, clearly German, preluded in the subject, but, so feebly, as was natural, that they were soon forgotten. The movement found its Luther in Hugo de Groote; a citizen of a State which commerce, industry, and liberty—and more than all, the influx of philosophic foreigners—had made at that time intellectual head of the German people.

That this is the solution of that immense vogue of Grotius which his critics and disciples have sought so long and vainly, the former to explain away, the others to justify, we now

proceed to fortify from the work itself. This detail is made necessary by the nature of the composition, and will, moreover, be a proper tribute to the failure of former labourers. The treatise of Grotius is quite devoid of frame, or what we might describe as an osseous system. In all the soft and minor parts of flesh and floridity, the texture and the tone are very nearly unexceptionable: the terms are well chosen, the construction is natural, the expression clear, easy, even elegant, within each period. But when you contemplate the whole it darkens to a mere mass; sound, undoubtedly, and substantial, and with a garniture of classic literature, but still reminding you of a Dutch burgomaster, all fat, furs, and frills. Quite the opposite in this also, as well as in the principle, to the gaunt yet not ungraceful organisation of the work of Suarez. But this defect itself is a mark of his mission, a consequence of the amalgamations of transition. Another source of the deformity is the procedure of analysis, which is the method proper to this personal point of view, and which works by dissolution, and not by construction. The confusion and procedure was well remarked by Mackintosh, who speaks of Grotius as 'examining original principles only occasionally 'and incidentally, as they grow out of the questions he is to 'decide.' This he styles 'a disorderly method, which exhibits 'the elements of the science in the form of scattered discussions.' But the principles really 'original' of Grotius—those which made his work an era and himself a man of genius—escaped the discernment of Mackintosh, as of the rest. The objective principles intended were all borrowed, or were treated by Grotius on the footing of mere precedents. And his 'disorderly method' proceeded precisely from the effort to conciliate those heterogeneous principles with his own point of view, which was the opposite and individual. The question is, then, to make this clear by illustration, and by examples detached from the main aspects of the treatise On War and Peace.

And, first, as to the method. The innovation, of which the blemishes of composition are marks, must have worked, as has been said, by the process of analysis. It thus moved backwards from the multitude of parts to the whole; or, in the terms of the case, from the individual will, to the general, presented by the Church as the will of God. But this pretension being rejected, and its subversion the very object, some other generality must be procured to substitute it. Otherwise the innovator could not move a step, as without a goal to guide him, or even a rule of judgment; for nothing can be viewed as parts or proofs save with relation, the former to a whole, and the others

to a principle. This principle or whole, therefore, Grotius must *assume;* and he could have found or fancied it but in the concourse of human wills. Hence the store which he sets by the incessant citation of writers of all sorts and sects, without distinction: for him it was enough that they were human. Meanwhile, although the fallacy of this circular reasoning — or setting up a principle imagined from the cases, and citing then the cases in proof of the principle — be easily detected in a speculative argument, yet, when relating to a long and large tract of human history, it may escape for ages the most powerful of comprehensions. This is the apology of all the failures above alluded to; and, first of all, of Grotius's own incongruities. In fact, the innovator always makes a fallacious compromise, to shield his new hypothesis by the sanction of the received doctrine. Thus, while Grotius passed the source of International Law from the dogmas of theology to the dictates of conscience, he keeps the Deity as common origin of the conflicting sources. Again (lib. i. 2. § v.), he makes the *jus naturæ* —including *human* nature, at least elsewhere, if not also there— to resist the Divine will; and yet he accepts the same will as the source of both. For although the law in question proceeds *naturally* from man — *ex principiis homini internis*, these principles themselves had been implanted by God. In short, so wholly was the mind of Grotius controlled by these double measures, that they passed, as is known, into his practical life, in some attempts to reconcile the Reformation with the Church.

Starting, then, from this hypothesis of a primordial law implanted by the Deity in the minds of all mankind, our author opens his preliminaries by engaging with Carneades, who took the ancient and inductive view of judging from the facts. These facts reported that the men of different countries, classes, ages, differed all from one another in their sentiments respecting justice, and as widely as the lower animals diverge in their special instincts; from which the sceptic concluded that there could be no fixed standard, and that their conduct was simply the dictate of utility. Grotius replies, with characteristic logic, that man is an animal peculiar in kind; that he is endowed with a social instinct (*οικειωσις*); that children are disposed to serve and pity suffering children. We can imagine the smile of something not remote from pity with which the dialectical athlete of antiquity would have, on hearing such an argument, regarded his kind antagonist. The thing is indeed both superficial and evasory. That the mere individual of the lowest human races does not differ disproportionately from the highest animals, is the evident conclusion of natural science. The

disparity which strikes us in the case of civilised man is, in its positive character, a result of society, and then is negatively aggravated by the common oversight of the historic series that graduates the junction. Grotius carries back to this primitive or savage stage the attributes of justice acquired by his own mind. Moreover, granting his assumption, it would not answer Carneades, whose position was founded chiefly on the human species socialised, and who alluded to the animals but as extension or illustration. Then again, the 'social instinct' is, *per contra*, found in brutes, and Grotius himself dilates upon the topic. From this blunder he escapes but by another assumption, to wit, that the said instinct proceeds, in the brutes, *ex principio aliquo intelligente* EXTRINSECO. In fine, the good or the pity shown by children to each other might more naturally be referred to the absence of all reflection, and the tendency to lend their own feelings to their like. That he who pities another thinks upon himself, has been asserted of a much less unsophisticated age. Do children ever *incommode* themselves to serve others? So that we fear our kindly Dutchman could have made a poor resistance to the terrible polemic who astounded the stolid Romans.

We regret also that Dr. Whewell, a commentator upon Bacon, instead of rectifying these blunders, commits an aggravation. He mistranslates Grotius' rendering of *oikeiosis*, by calling it 'the domestic instinct or feeling of kindred.' This is quite the contrary of even the verbal meaning, and what is still worse it goes counter to the argument. The word 'domestic' or private means the opposite to sociable; and the discerning comment of the text of Grotius—*cum his qui sui sunt* GENERIS—does not relate to 'kindred,' but to kind, to mankind; in distinction from the animals of which he was just speaking. Moreover, the Greek term should have cautioned the translator. Its termination is a metaphorical form denoting *like*. The literal rendering is therefore 'domestic-like'; or having a good will towards all mankind, *like* that which is entertained towards one's family, and which is shared by the lower animals.

But to return to Grotius, in whom it was no modesty to own that he thus founded his doctrine *rudi modo*. He defines his theme of Justice in a manner scarce less clumsy, to consist in leaving, or in rendering, to others that which is their own; *quæ jam sunt alterius alteri permittantur aut impleantur*. The question was, By what title it came to *be* 'their own'? Or how the term property can have at all a meaning, without a pre-existent law of justice to constitute it? This accordingly was tacitly assumed by the author, in the manner above stated to characterise his system. Civil rights he derives likewise from

this supposed mutual compact; and his sanction for the source is, that 'some mode of obliging themselves was *necessary* among 'men, and no other could be found.' But where was then the natural and innate law of justice? And where, again, was the volitional virtue of the compact, if it has been in any way a result of 'necessity'?

Much less immoral assuredly than this would be the principle of Utility which Grotius so repudiates. He opposes to it human nature 'as the mother of Natural laws, and obligation by compact 'as the mother of Civil laws'; though he had just renounced or subordinated both these 'mothers.' The present statement is however right enough in itself, if considered from the special point of view of the author; indeed it quite precisely delineates his innovation, which lies in really founding all law on moral man. But this point of view is not exclusive of utility, which rather indeed includes it as being opposite and general. The reason why Grotius and the epoch he introduces are rhetorically so severe upon the test of utility, is simply that they saw it from the individual side. Here it certainly is 'vicious,' for each person seeks his own. But then it is not utility, in a consistent sense, as the individuals all must judge it differently from each other. The term can be proper but in reference to wholes, as in the formula of Bentham, the greatest good of the greatest number; and here it always coincides with the just and true as well as good. Thus it was the declared principle of Government with the ancients, whose conception of the State was collective, not partitive; in modern times, when the society is considered through the multitude, or in its moral elements, the word utility comes to shock. Accordingly Grotius is, after all, obliged to recognise it as the source of International law (Prolog. 17.) He even admits that it may sanction all laws; but that we feel ourselves led to them 'by nature' without it. How, again, without it, could even nature lead us? But there is no rigorous reasoning with Grotius, and our object is, beside, not correction, but characterisation.

To the same character belongs his habitual confusion of the ancient *Jus* with *Jura* or Rights in the modern sense. The former was a relation between subject and object. But rights are affected to subjects alone; they are held to exist independently of objects. In short, they are metaphysical or 'moral entities,' and have been so termed and treated by Puffendorf, who ran them out instructively to some of their absurdities. This consequence may also be exhibited directly in the case of what Grotius calls the Rights of War. For war has no rights in the sense of *Jus*. *Silent* JURA *inter arma*. The rules imposed

upon it are rules or rights *against* it, supervening from the positive order of justice. War is strictly the negation of this justice by appeal to force; a degradation from the social and the rational sphere, of which alone the very idea of justice is predicable, to the brute contention of physical force. Here the subject and the object are clashed into collision, and, *ipso facto*, annihilate all social *relation*. Grotius himself repeats, after Aristotle, that war is allowable but on failure of justice. How then is war to retain rights after justice is gone? The conclusion is that Grotius was too much absorbed in his own view of rights, to attend to the discrepancy. That view is the personal or subject matter of the *Jus;* and its useful destination in nature or history is to batter down the opposite and despotic reign of Duties. These had previously their epoch of existence without Rights; they so exist in Asia, generally, to this day; in America, with respect to the slave population; in Europe itself, as a Christian community: for none of us pretend to have rights against God, but only duties towards him. But between these extreme views lies the ratio called Justice.

Hence, again, it is that Grotius criticises Aristotle on the subject of his principle of ethics, the golden mean. Admitting it in most things, he opposes it in others. He takes exception to Boasting and Dissimulation being assigned as the extremes to which Truth is the middle; they being, he alleges, not 'co-'ordinate' with it. But he judges from the popular and superficial sentiment: the terms are co-ordinate, if properly interpreted, as meaning truth exaggerated and truth curtailed.

The competency of Grotius as a critic upon Aristotle is further betrayed upon another conception, although a less complete one, of that sovereign intellect. We allude to the famous division of Justice into Commutative and Distributive. These the author illustrated by comparing them respectively with arithmetical and geometrical proportions; the former proceeding by strict equality, the other by analogy or equality of relations: the one affected to the civil order, the other to the political. Grotius adopts both the principle and illustration, but, as usual, makes no scruple in finding exceptions; and in this we must allow that he is sanctioned by the translator, himself a voluminous writer on these subjects. 'If (objects Grotius) there be 'but one person fit for a political office, it is by commutative '[not distributive] justice that it is given him.' Thus he imagines that a general principle may be set aside by his mere hypothetical 'if'; the hypothesis being here, moreover, effectually absurd. For it scarcely could happen that only one person in a political community was fit for a normal office; and at all

events the fitness must be of course relative, and thus in analogical proportion to the demand. Thus, the 'fitness' is employed to disprove its own import. We do not say of the commutative or arithmetical justice, for example, a debt, that the payment is 'fit,' but absolutely that it is *just:* the comparative ability of the debtor is not considered. On the other hand, the claimant of distributive justice would, however exclusively and eminently 'fit,' be never said to have a like title to the office. He would be laughed at if he laid it before a court of justice — as he generally is indeed in even the court of politics. But Grotius, as usual, saw the person, not the proportion. And from this subjective point of view the graduation disappears — as in the interval alluded to between the savage and the citizen — by an illusion to which half the errors of our philosophers are traceable.

It may be proper to subjoin a word or two of explanation respecting the incompleteness of this doctrine, which naturally escaped Grotius, while he quarrelled with what is faultless. The two 'proportions' of Aristotle are contraries to one another: the first, the principle of order; the second, that of progress. By consequence, their tendency is to destroy each other; of which an illustration must be familiar to British readers in the theory of Malthus, which is an application of them. The conflict, however, produces a third form, to combine and conciliate them, which is organisation; and which will doubtless redeem us from the predictions of Malthus. It was indicated first by Bodin, in his Republic, and named with full propriety the 'Harmonic' proportion. He thus supplied the 'middle term' of Aristotle's own system, which the analytic bent of this philosopher often missed.

In fine, a last criterion of the theory of Grotius, as moral, hypothetical, analytic, self-contradictory, is less unnoticed, because more obvious than the preceding, by the commentators. All have clamoured at his sanctioning slavery and despotism. By some, such as Rousseau, invectives the most bitter have been poured upon a man of independence and deep humanity, for want of seeing the nature of his doctrine and its consequences. The right to rule absolutely being regarded as an entity *inherent in the person of the ruler alone,* and therefore transferable by him alone to a successor; what is more logical in the one case than passive obedience, and in the other, than the patrimonial sovereignties of Grotius? So with slavery: it may be argued, that if every man be born with 'natural rights,' of which of course the first must be that to his own person, you cannot deny him the right of self-forfeiture or alienation,

and consequently the essential legitimacy of slavery, supposing the slave to have used his liberty of action to divest himself of liberty. 'The fault of Grotius in this instance — but one he rarely commits — is the rigorous adherence to the consequences of his principles. The sole escape from them is by setting them against one another. Thus, if man has a 'right' to dispose of his own person he has an equal 'right' to undo that disposition; for both are acts of will, of which this liberty is the essence. He cannot then bind himself to slavery. But he is equally powerless with regard to all contracts. Hence the salvo of 'necessity' above brought in by Grotius to give some fixity of ground to the shifting sands of compact. And all for want of seeing that laws of all sorts and justice itself proceed, not from the individual, but directly from society, and are good or bad, right or wrong, not absolutely in themselves, but with relation to the character and civilisation of the nation.

The great epochal revolution in international law, of which the principle has thus been verified through the main features of the work of Grotius, has been noticed by several British writers, though but empirically. The second set of Stewart's objections was made to the hypothesis of a præsocial system of justice or compact. But had he seen that the method of Grotius was analytic, he might have recognised that the procedure was legitimate, however erroneous the conception of its principle. The use of such a fiction as a fulcrum of exploration was not marred for the time by false belief in its reality. Hallam, who replies that Grotius did not hold it, was mistaken through a like misapprehension of him. He, however, seizes the positive aspect, in pronouncing that '*ethical* speculations are in fact the real subject of the book, 'since it avowedly treats of obligations on the *conscience* of 'mankind and of their rulers.'* Mackintosh, with still more specific discernment, gives it the singular title of '*private* ethics'†, meaning, no doubt, the ethics of the individual; and remarks that it resulted 'from classing (in a manner which *seems* '*peculiar to modern times*) the duties of individuals with those 'of nations.' But whence this 'classing' came, or whither it tended, or whether wrong or right, he does not say or see. Yet this has been the closest approach, perhaps, ever made to a precise distinction of the spirit of the work of Grotius. Except, however, the heretical sagacity of Rome, which had long before placed it in the limbo of its Index. And in fine,

* Lit. Eur., vol. ii. p. 586.
† Dis. Law of Nat. and Nations, p. 4.

lest an assertion so sweeping should seem presumptuous, we add the decision of the learned Von Ompteda, in his excellent survey of the writings on the Law of Nations: 'Indeed,' says he, 'it is almost inconceivable, but nevertheless true, that 'among the prodigious crowd of commentators and translators 'who have dissected, investigated, and illustrated his work, not 'a single writer has contemplated the subject in the precise 'point of view in which Grotius conceived it, or judged cor- 'rectly of his design.' And this author's own effort, though better far than most of them, may now be perceived not to escape the condemnation.

We have thus, as far as possible within a few pages, sought to circumscribe the place and characterise the features, historical, moral, and internationally Jural, of the great work of Grotius in the march of the subject; and to that end have also sketched a general chart of the progression. The result has been to discover that the revolution wrought by him consisted in transferring the chief ground of the Laws of Nations, from the ancient, theocratic, and territorial basis,—somewhat mitigated by the family humanity of Catholicity,—to the Protestant and personal ground of the human will. Hence the term *jus gentium* VOLUNTARIUM, which Grotius had been the first to introduce, and which marks throughout his chaos of quotation and adoption, the new vein of inspiration that gave him value and vitality. The other titles sometimes classed with it, as the conventional and consuetudinal, are to be understood as but species of the voluntary. All these proceed, as has been noted by Wolff, from volition or consent in different forms; 'pre- 'sumed' in the volential, 'express' in the conventional, and 'tacit' in the consuetudinal. So that the explanation embraces the whole ground of what is sometimes designated as the modern Law of Nations. And so trenchantly does all this appertain to Grotius, that the gradual approaches which led to the change, in the usual way of Nature who does nothing great abruptly, were by the Spanish Jurists immediately preceding him distinguished by the name of *jus gentium* SECUNDARIUM. The *voluntarium* could not, in fact, be used by the Spaniards, of whom the two ablest, Soto and Suarez, were seen to have contended, that the human will can furnish a foundation for nothing like law. The working of this new vein we now proceed to indicate along to the present state; and this must also react in confirmation of the acquired results, while completing the historical survey of the subject, and thereby directing its ulterior cultivation.

And here a fact presents itself which, as a strict consequence from what has been determined of the doctrine of Grotius, we feel tempted to call a still greater discovery. It is, that all the writers since Grotius, on the Law of Nations, and assuredly their 'name is legion,' have been, without a single original exception, either Germans or generally of the Teutonic race. How was this peculiarity to be hitherto conceived? The Germans are a people of no foreign intercourse, and no domestic stimulus from politics or public life; and the diplomacy of their crowd of little courts amongst themselves is scarcely graver than that of the tribes of their ancestors: what then should lead their writers to agitate the 'Laws of Nations?' They agitate, it is quite true, most things upon earth, and in the heavens above, and in the waters under the earth. But then some other nations partake with them here. They are great metaphysicians, but so are the Scotch; the French also have metaphysicians, acute but superficial; the Hindoos are metaphysicians, if we credit their translators. But no nation outside of the Germanic family has yet produced an original writer on the Law of Nations. Is it then that this law, as now resolved to its true principles—a law of personality, resistance, will, and warfare — has anything peculiarly congenial to this people? Committing this conclusion or question to the reader, we pass on to the principal successors of Grotius.

The first of these successors in time and perhaps mind, and therefore probably no debtor to the Hollander, was Hobbes. Grotius began with the rights of war: and this was in fact the right beginning of the Law of Nations, and the source, as we have shown, of his inspiration and originality. But the weight of his learning and the prestige of the authority from which he had but half escaped, forthwith reversed the order, and swayed him practically to give precedence to the rights of peace and nature, to which the warfare was exceptional and as a means to an end. Hobbes began in the same way, but kept consistently to the order. The international relations were but fear, force, warfare, and nations were identical in this respect to individuals. Wherefore, the primitive and natural state was war. And force, by consequence, is the source of all authority, law, and right. Thus, by a logical sequence the most regular and rigorous, he annihilated all justice, nay, morality itself, by adhering to the individual *jus* of Grotius. For morality, as a *rule*, is not a property of individuals, whether personal or national, but really of society. The consistency of Hobbes — which thus supplies the best of comments upon what we have been hinting of the dangers of this principle — was, accordingly, too shocking

to allow of his finding any speculative followers among his own countrymen, The 'social compact' of Locke was a mild and municipal form of it.

Puffendorf, proceeding avowedly upon Grotius, consolidated the perversion, but clouded it with 'moral' entities.' He took the practical arrangement of the master for his guidance, beginning with the Law of Nature and passing to the Law of Nations. But instead of seeing the normal antagonism between these sources, he made the latter but a simple extension of the former; or more really perhaps, the *jus naturæ* of the ancients, a *reflection* of the *jus gentium* VOLUNTARIUM of Grotius. The result was a reinforcement of lawless volition, by the natural sanction of animal utility.

Next succeeded, in the genuine or Germanic line, a reactive rectification, in the system of Wolff. This description may be proved by a single and a short extract. The author declares formally as motive to his work: OMNIUM *ferè animos occupavit perversa illa opinio, quasi fons juris gentium sit* UTILITAS PROPRIA; *inde contingit id* POTENTIÆ COÆQUARI. *Damnamus hoc in privatis, et in rectore civitatis.* Wolff then detached the Law of Nature from that of Nations; and this, in turn, he dissevered from the law of individuals, with which it was confounded by his predecessors since Hobbes and Grotius.

The highest expression of this oscillation is to be found in Kant and his followers. Yet Dr. Whewell cites approvingly a late German writer, who sets the manner of these philosophers, in 'basing Rights upon the insulated existence of the individual,' in contrast with that of Grotius, who 'placed them on the social 'relations.'* Grotius professed indeed to base them on society; but his real basis was, as shown, the socialised individuals. His main argument was drawn from 'feelings' of bounty and pity; but feelings, even though facts, would still be far from 'relations.' Fichte, then, himself, the 'extreme left' of this school of jurists whose 'perpetual hammering on the innate freedom 'of the individual' is denounced by Dr. Whewell with a creditable instinct, is the quite natural development of the doctrine of Grotius, to which the Doctor yields his deliberate applause.

The succession brings us next to a Doctor of Laws, a fellow countrymen also, as we must be glad to claim him. But is the succession a progression? It certainly is with regard to the Germans, at least if we may judge by the practical utility of their writings. The thinking may be slighter, the discussion less exhaustive, the arrangement as lax, and the

* Pref. vi.

learning not so genuine; but the principles are sounder and the purposes more practical.

It is not easy to characterise the work of Dr. Phillimore, even with the new aid of the gauging scale we have endeavoured to delineate. One can hardly say to what school to refer it; whether it should be the modern, the mediæval, or even the ancient; but it is certain it does not form a school or scheme of its own. The best indication that perhaps can be given is the choice which he makes among the principal sanctions, successively assigned by mankind to the laws in question, as unfolded in the foregoing historical progression. In the most formal of his vague statements on this cardinal point, the author tells us, that 'states are governed partly by Divine and partly by Positive law. The Divine is either that which is written by the '*finger** of God on the heart of man, when it is called Natural 'law; or that which has been miraculously made known to him, 'when it is called revealed or Christian law. The primary 'source of International Jurisprudence then is Divine law.' (Vol. i. p. 15.)

This, it is perceived, is far enough from Grotius, who made the prime source independent of God and Providence. It retrogrades beyond the Spanish Jesuit Suarez, and would have been accepted by the canonists of the tenth century, or as a motto to the *Extravagances* of Pope John XXII. Yet our author, moreover, at the same time dismisses the very Chosen people of this his Divine law, with merely the remark, that 'the peculiar dispensation under which the Jewish nation was 'placed, &c., renders vain any attempt to trace in the history 'of that people the vestiges of International Jurisprudence.' Selden, however, found it bodily with that people.

Again, morality as well as International law is transferred from the German and human basis to the Romish. 'Just' (says the author) 'as it is not *morally* competent to any individual state to make laws which are at variance with the law 'of God, whether natural or revealed, so neither is it morally 'competent to any assemblage of states to make treaties or '*adopt* customs which contravene that law.' (Vol. i. p. 26.) Very good! But what *is* that law? or *which* of its interpretations? It was the maxim by which Hildebrand aspired to rule the globe.

One is prompted irresistibly to ask the like questions, in reading what was meant for a definition of the subject. 'The

* A particularity of Anthropomorphism which might have been dispensed with in a definition of science.

'Law of Nations is said to be founded upon justice, equity, 'convenience, and the reason of the thing.' Assuredly, if this be so, it cannot want supporters, though the number of legs ill marks the force of the animal. But *what* is justice, and what is equity, what is convenience, or reason? Are not they, each, more problematical than the thing to be defined; not to speak of the confusion superadded by the multiplicity? The first rule (we may be pardoned for reminding) of definition commands that the terms and the things so employed shall, if not completely determinate and familiar, at least be somewhat more so than the object to be designated. In the case before us, the rule is inverted. But perhaps, from the form of expression, it was borrowed, if this be an excuse for the evasion of a better. The 'reason of the thing' has a Germanic look.

There is reason indeed to think the author drew from that source too implicitly as well as largely, to the neglect of his better judgment. For example, he adopts, as he owns, from Savigny the following curious doctrine respecting the State, and which his English common sense would have surely rejected.

'It has been said (says Dr. Phillimore), that states are capable of rights and liable to obligations; but it must be remembered that they can never be the subjects of *criminal* law. This law is concerned with a *natural* person; a being of thought, feeling, and will. A *legal* person is not a being of these attributes, though, through the medium of representation and government, the will of certain individuals is considered as the will of the corporation; but only for certain purposes. There must be *individual* will to found the jurisdiction of criminal law; will by *representation* cannot found this jurisdiction. Nor is this proposition inconsistent with the will required by rights and obligations. A legal as well as a natural person has this limited will; it is consistent with the idea and object of a legal person. But the attribute of this unlimited will requisite for the commission of crime is wholly inconsistent with this idea and object.' (Vol. i. p. 5.)

Excluding a little of what seemed to be surplusage, we retain the exact terms, and the tissue, and the italics. The passage will thus furnish incidentally a sample of the author's mode of managing a deductive argument. We feel entirely sure that he would have done it otherwise, to vindicate a client in Doctors' Commons or the Court of Admiralty; that is to say, in a case which he had studied and mastered. In copying from the German, he seems to labour as if *in vacuo*, and the reasoning involves, among others, the following consequences:—That there can be, against civil rights, no criminal wrongs, since the things are incompatible with one another in the same subject;

that therefore criminal wrongs must have criminal rights to answer to them; that governments, moreover, can represent the one, to the exclusion of the other of these close correlations; and this, because a whole will is requisite to commit crime, whereas a fraction of volition is competent to acquire rights — as if volition was not whole in every act however limited, the limitation applying of course not to the essence, but to the objects; in fine, that the representative will, although limited, is capable, within that limit, of exercising rights, while it cannot represent, nor even itself commit, a crime within similar limits, or unless licensed to commit all crime. We say nothing of the error of placing social crime in will; it pervades the whole jural philosophy we are discussing. Nor of the crudity of assimilating governments to corporations; which is as if an excrescence in the physical body were mistaken for an organ, or rather for an offspring. Nor of imagining societies to be less 'natural' than men. Nor of the fallacy of assuming that there is a fixed line, in the nature of things, between civil and criminal laws; as if it was forgotten that the murders of to-day were with our forefathers liquidated by the payment of a small fine, and that a damage, then civil, cannot therefore be now criminal.

On the merits of the point, it is needless here to add, that International Law is just the Criminal Law among states; as the criminal law proper has been also shown to be a like negative or penal code among fellow citizens. The whole difference lies merely in the machinery of execution. And if there was, as there will one day undoubtedly be, an international tribunal of justice in Europe, the completeness of the analogy would be discerned by even the multitude. It was discerned long ago by the sagacious Hooker, who says: 'The necessity of war, and the laws relating to it, are a consequence of the *depraved nature of societies; just as* the necessity of the *criminal* law of society is a consequence of the depraved nature of individuals.' And what is curious is, that Dr. Phillimore cites approvingly this passage! (vol. iii. p. 67.) But so, repeatedly throughout, the *pro* and *con.* with like *nonchalance.*

Thus much for the principles of Dr. Phillimore. And now for a sample of his method of arrangement. The first that encounters us, on coming to his programme, is duly enough the article of 'foundations.' But these are distributed into 1. The *laws* of the subject matter; 2. The *subjects* of these laws; 3. The *objects* of the laws; 4. Certain *subjects* requiring particular consideration, &c. Now, all this sounds rather orderly,

and was evidently so regarded. It is, however, in good logic, a curious topsy-turvy. The laws should, on the one hand, not be classed with *their own* 'foundations;' and, on the other, should not *precede* either their subjects or their objects. Consisting in relations between these two terms, they on the contrary should follow them, in treatment as they do in nature. So, moreover, with these terms themselves, in their turn, the category of 'objects' should have been treated first, and not the reverse as in the series of the author. The objects are the more fundamental and simple, and afford the philosophical clue to the 'subjects.' Accordingly we saw that in the history of the law of nations, men were led by mere instinct, or rather impotence, to the objects first; that then the law both international and national was wholly objective; and that the subjective factor, with its symbol of will and rights, is a development of Christian or still more modern date. This order would besides have spared the author the uncouthness of inserting the 'objects' between two sorts of 'subjects'; a recurrence which might have admonished him of the error. In fine, it is after both objects and subjects — which constitute the proper 'foundations' of the theme — that the laws should have been ranged as the resulting relations. But these are evidently matters on which the learned author has not bestowed elaborate or strenuous cogitation.

As a consequence or consonance, there is also in the details much confusion of argument and even laxity of expression. The author treats, for example, as *International* rights, those of self-preservation, acquisition, possession; and not in any particular special to the national subject, but as they are laid down in the municipal law, which ought however to be presupposed in the treatment of the international. Then, if his subject be on this side overloaded with extraneous matter, he has elsewhere failed to seize it in the proper extension. For instance, in the preface, where he gives a sketch historical of the progress of this subject from the earliest known times, and where some twenty-four pages are devoted to England, while to all the world beside is apportioned but ten, yet, throughout and with apparent inadvertence, the Civil Law is represented as convertible with International Law in England. It is but natural then that the ancients should not be sketched with great intelligence. Accordingly our author assures us that the Romans had a 'regular system of international relations,' [law]; to wit the *Jus Feciale* and the *Recuperatores*. What the former amounted to, we have explained already. The *recuperatores* were, not merely not international, but were no constitutional officers at all. They were only what in English law is familiar

as arbitrators, designated by the prætor or by the parties themselves, or by the general, where the litigants were of the army and on service. *Dabantur* (says Livy) *et ab imperatoribus contentione orta inter milites.* If they had to do with foreigners, it was but at Rome, and in the same informal and municipal quality. Still more curious, if possible, our Doctor of Civil Law recites that Aristotle wrote a treatise on the Law of Nations. He was not then aware of the blunder above alluded to, though Dr. Whewell mentions the correction in his Grotius, which had been already for a year or two before the public.

The real value of these volumes does not, as may be perceived, lie in accuracy of reasoning on the first principles of the science, but in the applications of them which are here collected with considerable labour and research. And this may make good the title Commentaries, which implies no more than mere practical explanation. Had Dr. Phillimore but kept to this, in the shape of short introductions and occasional notes, to his collection of documents, and also curtailed the biographical eulogiums which he scatters with a kindly or forensic liberality, not merely across the Rhine but even beyond the Atlantic — had he done this, his work would merit well of the country. For nothing of the kind, or at least of equal completeness, has been hitherto presented to the British public. Nor ought he to have disdained a mode of treating the subject, originated by the great Leibnitz, and pursued by the industrious Möser. But to give it a mere frontispiece or rather *facing* of theory, was but to cast discredit on the honest edifice behind.

In fine, for these and most of the other shortcomings alluded to, the Doctor's own plea should be accepted in apology, namely, that he has been the first in the English language to make a systematic attempt on the subject. The fact is more flattering to himself than to a country which, of all, is the most merged in international relations, and in which the study of International Law ought to be one of the most constant studies of philosophers and statesmen, instead of being the most neglected. We have indicated what appear to us to be the defects of Dr. Phillimore's work; its good qualities are sure to be discerned by a shrewd public; for in all things the positive is more perceptible than the privative. The first of virtues in all books is the *lucidus ordo:* but, without it, a book of science is a detestable travesty, unfit for the intellect or eyes of gods or men; and we may add, with the satirist, unfit for even the sign-posts. Lucid *expression* will not do. Nothing can exceed, for instance, Grotius in this. His terms are so proper, his sentences so simple, the structure of his periods so natural and neat, that he constantly reminds

one of the minute precision of the filigree and tracery of Gothic architecture. But if you lift the eyes from this microscopic gazing and try to look back through a few paragraphs, not to say chapters, the vision is confounded by a blurred and quaint chaos, which completes your reminiscence of a mediæval cathedral. On the contrary, the work of Suarez is a Vatican of proportions, a 'vastness that grows, *but grows to harmonise.*' Dr. Phillimore too had a species of plan, although the principles and texture are not, as we have seen, the soundest; and he has filled it up, as he indeed with modest truth expresses it himself, principally by historical and legal disquisitions (many of them of great interest), on the application of what is loosely termed the Law of Nations to the practical questions of public law.

And this remark brings us to the third and final section of our design, which was to trace the Law of Nature and the Law of Nations progressively and distinctly from their respective sources to their final application to human affairs. Our limits warn us, however, that we can do no more than trace an outline of this part of the subject. Perhaps the most compendious characterisation may be this: That, while the two preceding phases of universal jurisprudence bore, the first upon created nature, in guise of Duties to the Divinity; and the second upon human or moral nature, expressed by Rights — the final and future state takes the middle course of History, upon the rational relations between Nature and Humanity. Excluding, therefore, on the one hand, the Law of Nature proper, and on the other the Civil, or individual law of men, the grand interlying region which belongs to the present subject might be designated systematically, in those three constituent aspects, as the JUS *gentium*, the JURA *gentium*, and the LEX *gentium* respectively; or the Duties, the Rights, the Laws of Nations.

In the strict and proper sense of the term Law, it cannot be said that any binding obligation is imposed by authority on sovereign and independent states, other than the obligations which they themselves recognise as essential conditions of their own civilisation, determined partly by legal tradition and partly by the moral dictates of public opinion. Thus, to quote a familiar instance, England has endeavoured for half a century to induce all civilised states to rank the slave trade amongst offences against the Law of Nations committed on the high seas. Her success in this humane enterprise has been exactly proportioned to the morality and advancement of the nations with which she had to deal. Treaties, the decisions of maritime courts, the text writers on these subjects, and, in some few instances, the collective Declarations of the Great Powers, are

the forms which these principles assume, and they constitute all that can strictly be called the written Law of International Relations. This written law is the offspring of those principles which we have traced from the highest regions of religion and philosophy; and its progress is the progress of civilisation itself. Its application is more direct to occurrences and the dealings of men upon the high seas than upon land, because the sea lies beyond the range of municipal and territorial jurisdiction. Hence it is only by this species of international compact or recognition of common principles that life, property, and freedom can be protected on the sea as they are by each state within the land boundaries of its own dominions. But the principles themselves, being those of eternal morality and justice, inseparable from the common interest of mankind, are of universal application; and we doubt not, that with the progress of civilisation, the nations of the world will speedily proceed in this direction, from *antagonism* to *organisation*. In this sense the extension of the principles of free trade, and of those mechanical inventions which have so powerfully contributed in our own times to unite in closer brotherhood the families of civilised Europe, are of an importance far exceeding their immediate and material results. The Declaration of the Congress of Paris in 1856, which established the principle of trade by neutrals during war, subject to no restraint but that of actual blockades, and which abolished the lawless plunder of privateering, was another memorable step; and we trust it will at no distant time be followed by measures tending to secure to private property on the high seas that immunity which has long been extended, even during war, to private property on land. The stricter application of the law of non-intervention, which means in other terms the refusal to allow a foreign force to control the just and natural course of events in another country,—whether it be to restore dynasties which have fallen by their follies, or to uphold institutions which are crumbling to decay,—is a further homage paid to the great principle of national independence, and to the right of men to establish amongst themselves a government of their choice.

From all these examples, which could be indefinitely multiplied, it is obvious that England is interested beyond all the other Powers of the world, in maintaining, promoting, and extending the great principles of International Law. She is interested in the maintenance of peace between all civilised nations, for she has long abandoned all schemes of conquest; and if her armies are summoned to the field it is in defence of the principles of International Law, which more barbarous peoples

have not yet learned to obey. She is interested in the spread of commerce and the fullest liberty of trade, both in peace and war, by land and sea, because it is evident that the nation whose produce and whose ships are most widely scattered over the globe, must be the first to suffer by restrictions placed upon commercial enterprise. She is interested in the growth of free institutions throughout the world, because in the political faith and experience of England, international relations consist not in the alliances of despots for the mutual extinction of popular rights, but in the establishment of independent nations and governments respecting the rights of others, and claiming the same respect for their own. The welfare of the world depends on the maintenance of these principles, and although we acknowledge with gratitude the progress they have made in the last half-century, we cannot forget that a few months of general war—a few months given to passion instead of reason, and to force instead of law—would have the effect of a conflagration in the stateliest edifice which has yet been raised by the genius of man. May Heaven avert the omen! and may the rulers who bear the personal responsibility of the conduct of public affairs in all the great States of Europe remember that no glory or advantage is for a moment comparable to the preservation of those principles which place the moral and material interests of mankind under the ægis of public law.

ART. V.—1. *Les Églises de la Terre Sainte.* Par le Comte MELCHIOR DE VOGÜÉ. Paris: 1860.

2. *An Essay on the Ancient Topography of Jerusalem.* By JAMES FERGUSSON, F.R.A.S. London: 1847.

3. *The Holy City.* By GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D. *Including an Architectural History of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.* By ROBERT WILLIS, M.A. London: 1849.

4. *Later Biblical Researches in Palestine.* By EDWARD ROBINSON, D.D. London: 1856.

5. *The Dictionary of the Bible.* Edited by Dr. WILLIAM SMITH. Vol. I. London: 1860.

THE history of the Holy Sepulchre is practically the history of the Churches of the Holy Land. That marvellous tendency to localise every incident in the Gospel narratives, which was invested with the intensity of a passion, and which fastened on the most trivial and even ludicrous details, here reached its highest development. For the genuineness of this site there is the same absence of contemporary evidence as for that of other sites scarcely less reverenced by Christian tradition. Over all, again, the same uncertainty is thrown by the language of pompous historians, who cannot state a fact in plain words, or name a man except by a periphrasis. And not unfrequently, the wearisome pages of pilgrims utterly destitute of the faculty of historical criticism furnish our only means of ascertaining some event in the history, or some change in the form, of the building.

The difficulties thus created are in no slight degree increased by the strength of the associations which gather round the Holy Land, and by the credulity and scepticism to which they have given birth. It is not easy to retain the cold temper of a critic in a spot full of the most touching recollections: it is not easy, while standing in the very building, to reject the time-honoured traditions which consecrate its origin. Yet the genuineness of a site, and the history of a church which preserves it, although distinct questions, are matters of pure archæological inquiry, and must be settled strictly on archæological evidence, if they are ever to be settled at all. If this inquiry carries us to times, when the dearth of historical testimony throws us back upon oral tradition, or to writings in which fables and marvels predominate over facts, it should impose upon us only a nicer application of the canons of historical credibility.

Now, for the first three centuries of Christianity, we have scarcely anything but tradition to guide us with regard to the two most important sites in the topography of Jerusalem: and when we arrive at a period of which we have written accounts, we find the historians more or less influenced by that spirit to which every exceptional fact becomes a miracle, and everything for which they cannot account remains a mystery. As we descend to later times, we find this temper more prominent and absorbing: but it can scarcely be denied that even Eusebius, the earliest of these writers, is greatly under its influence. That the existence of such prepossessions must affect their authority, is unquestionable: but the point for decision is, how far they ought to affect it. The strongest prepossession or even hallucination on some subjects may coexist with clear perception and sound judgment on others. The prejudices of religious and devotional zeal are the strongest of all, and detract indefinitely from the authority of a writer on all matters which may be connected with them. Yet we should hold a man so influenced to be a competent witness on other points, if his truthfulness be not otherwise called in question. The testimony of an ecclesiastical historian may be very inconclusive, when he relates a series of prodigies, visions, and miracles, or states the doctrines of theological antagonists. But this cannot impair his authority when he gives the dimensions of a building, or describes the character of a given site. His religious zeal may express itself in poetical language, and we may make great qualifications for rhetorical exaggeration: but we are not hence justified in discrediting his words, when he asserts that a given building existed, or was destroyed, or restored, to his own knowledge. In our present subject, we believe that this critical canon is of the utmost importance; and we shall have to recur to it, in the hope that it may tend to set at rest some, at least, of the many vexed questions involved in it.

Facing each other on two neighbouring heights, at a distance of little more than 2000 feet, stand the mosques, which bear severally the names of Omar and El Aksa, and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The latter claims not only to enclose the sacred site from which it draws its name, but to represent by the strictest material succession the original church of Constantine. That such a church and on such a site was built by that emperor, is an indisputable fact; nor is it more doubtful that that building was desecrated and ruined by the Persians under Khosroës, and by the Jews who were not slothful in requiting under his auspices the resistance of the Christians to the rebuilding of their own sanctuary. The church, thus thrown

down, yet not utterly demolished, was replaced by more than one building of smaller size and far humbler pretensions. These in their turn were more systematically destroyed by order of the Fatimite Caliph Hakem in the eleventh century, even if we regard as slight the injuries which they are said to have suffered under the successors of Haroun al Reschid. Once more the buildings were restored by the aid of Byzantine emperors, not long before the Latin conquest of Jerusalem. A period of less than ninety years witnessed the triumph of the Crusaders under Godfrey of Boulogne, and their expulsion by the arms of Saladin. But during that time a more sumptuous building was raised, enclosing every sacred spot which had been embraced by the original design of Constantine. Those parts of the previous structures which had escaped the fury of Hakem, or had been rebuilt subsequently, were left untouched, except where interference was unavoidable in order to carry out their plan. The building thus modified and enlarged remained substantially unaltered until the great fire of 1808, the ravages of which were chiefly confined to the portions anterior to the Crusades.

Twice then does history record the demolition of this church, in addition to serious damage inflicted during the reign of El Mamoun: and all these disasters are distinctly stated to have befallen the church of Constantine, or those edifices which were raised on its ruins. The history of the site before any church was erected on it, is, as we have before said, a distinct question: it is a question not concerned with its historical records, but with oral tradition and the means which Constantine possessed for justifying his acceptance of it. That question has indeed a deep interest of its own; but, as we have viewed it, the genuineness of the site involves no necessary connexion with the work of the first Christian emperor. Nor should we have entered into this question but for an architectural theory, which makes the genuineness of the site a matter of primary importance.

The genuineness of the Holy Sepulchre demands therefore our first consideration, when it is employed as a strong argument to prove that the church of Constantine is not represented by the building which stands on its reputed site, but actually is the structure commonly known as the Mosque of Omar. This is the theory advanced by Mr. Fergusson in his essay on the Topography of Jerusalem, and maintained with great ingenuity, but with perhaps more than necessary vehemence of language. Standing unsupported in a position altogether his own, he might have obtained a wider acceptance of his views, if, abstaining from more special advocacy, he had confined himself strictly to an examination of all the documents which bear upon the sub-

ject. But if we cannot accept his conclusions, we must premise that this arises from no prepossession, either for or against his theory. The documentary and traditional evidence together with the architecture of the building furnishes the grounds of his conviction: and they are precisely the grounds on which we feel compelled to reject his hypothesis, while we acknowledge the brilliancy and vigour with which he has maintained it.

In support of this theory, he urges, first, the negative evidence of the Gospel narrative, which in his opinion is irreconcilable with any other. From that narrative he infers the proximity of the Prætorium to the place of Crucifixion, which he identifies with the spot where the usurping queen Athaliah was slain by the order of Jehoiada. This fact proves, he thinks, that a place of execution was near the temple, on its eastern side, and removes any necessity for supposing that our Lord passed through the city on the way to Golgotha. Of the sepulchre (which was nigh unto Calvary) he believes that a perfectly authentic tradition was preserved to the time of Constantine. The spot was marked by a temple of Venus, falsely ascribed to Hadrian, who built only a temple of Jupiter on the site of that of Solomon, and who could have no object in thus raising a building as a studied insult to an obscure sect with which he had no quarrel. The order for the removal of this temple was followed by the recovery of the sepulchre, which is no other than the rock Sakrah, the special object of Mahometan veneration. To this rock and to this alone will the descriptions in the New Testament and the ecclesiastical historians apply. It is a cave in a rock, where those who came to seek for the body of Christ must have 'looked down into the sepulchre,' whereas in the modern church the tomb is several feet above the pavement. On this rock, in conformity with Christian custom, Constantine built, not the Basilica (which was in its neighbourhood), but the round church, called the Anastasis, and now known as the Mosque of Omar. The Basilica or Martyrium was utterly destroyed by the order of Hakem, but the Golden Gateway, which formed the entrance to the Atrium, still remains, and opens into the Valley of Jehoshaphat. The architecture of this gateway, together with that of the Anastasis, proves indubitably its Constantinian origin. The forms employed in them display a greater departure from classical models than those of any building extant of the time of Hadrian, while they adhere to them more closely than the edifices of Justinian at Constantinople and Ravenna, built under the more immediate influence of the old traditions. Again, the ceiled roofing (a plan never adopted by the Mahometans) in the aisles of the Dome of Omar, is a

distinctively Roman work, and proves, not less than the round form of the building, that it can be no mosque either of Omar or of Ab dal Malek. But the present Church of the Sepulchre dates from the period of the Crusades, and retains portions of another and earlier building. At some period or other therefore during the tenth or eleventh centuries, there was a conscious and designed transfer of the site from the Hill of Sion to that on which rests the edifice of the Crusaders. This transference, Mr. Fergusson believes, was effected probably after the death of Hakem, between which time and the Latin conquest the Christians were enabled to begin the church which the Latins, not altogether unaware of the spuriousness of the site, determined to uphold as the genuine Sepulchre of their Lord.

This hypothesis Mr. Fergusson has supported with an ingenuity and cogency of which it would be difficult to form an adequate idea without perusing his essay. We will not say that his position is in no slight degree strengthened by the ambiguous and exaggerated language of ecclesiastical historians and rhetorical preachers; but if there are certain cardinal statements in their writings, or special topographical features with which his hypothesis cannot be reconciled, we see no other alternative than to abandon it, even if some of his arguments still remain unrefuted.

The few passages in the Gospels which in any way illustrate the site of the Crucifixion, do not appear conclusive on either side. There is nothing which absolutely excludes the supposition that from the judgment-seat the road to Calvary may have led through the city; and little can be inferred from the execution of Athaliah, the position of the Horse Gate being far from certain.* The genuineness of the site must therefore depend chiefly on the authenticity of the tradition during the first three centuries. Unless we reject the narrative of Eusebius altogether, we must believe that Constantine ordered a heathen temple to be removed, and that on its removal a sepulchral cave was brought to light. But when that temple was built, or whether it was intended to conceal the cave, and to conceal it by way of profanation and insult, are questions which (to say the least) cannot be determined by the tradition. In truth, the whole subject of the building of temples at Jerusalem to desecrate the site of others, is highly perplexing and suspicious. Eusebius, in his 'Life of Constantine,' merely states in general terms that wicked men had choked the cave with earth, covered it with a high mound afterwards paved, and built

* See 'Ancient Jerusalem,' by J. F. Thrupp, M.A., p. 171.

upon it a tomb for dead souls in the shape of a Temple of Aphrodité. Nor does he, in his 'Ecclesiastical History,' while relating the establishment of Ælia Capitolina, mention any temple as having been built by Hadrian. Socrates, living more than half a century later, speaks of a temple of Aphrodité over the Sepulchre, in language which scarcely implies that it was intended to conceal it. This ambiguity may, however, have been designed, as he is introducing the discovery, not so much of the Sepulchre, as of the Instruments of the Passion. Dion Cassius (and even his testimony is not that of a contemporary) attributes to Hadrian a temple of Jupiter built on the site of the Jewish temple; and the Bordeaux pilgrim, of the fourth century, states that he saw two statues of that emperor still erect on the same site. Of this temple and these statues, St. Jerome, who speaks of the temple covering the Sepulchre, makes no mention. But since for all such statements he could furnish no new evidence except from tradition, it is more important and more perplexing to remark that nothing is said of any such temple in conjunction with the attempt of Julian to restore the Jewish sanctuary. If that building was raised on the exact site and with the purpose of desecrating it, the work of demolition must have preceded that of restoration: nor does it much accord with the policy of Julian to remove a heathen temple because he wished to exalt Judaism at the expense of Christianity. Yet nothing is more probable than that Hadrian would order the erection of such a building, when even entrance into the Ælian colony was interdicted to the Jew; and few things, again, less probable than that he would inflict a similar insult on Christians who were permitted freely to reside in it. But the existence of another tradition assigning to Hadrian a temple of Adonis at Bethlehem, proves rather that he was popularly considered an opponent of holy sites in general. There remains the testimony of a series of coins, struck by Hadrian, the Antonini, and Aurelian. That of Hadrian has on its reverse a temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, with the inscription COL AEL CAP; the others represent the figure of Astarte under a tetrastyle temple with the letters C A C, indicating evidently the same words. But these coins do not seem to necessitate even the inference that such temples were built, and certainly they cannot be held to fix the sites on which they were severally raised. To say the least then, the evidence drawn from these temples and the traditions relating to them is inconclusive.

When, however, from these traditions we turn to the enterprise of Constantine, we cannot think that it exhibits much un-

certainty as to the position of the object sought for.* The style of Eusebius is wretched enough, and his inflated rhetoric constantly leaves ambiguous many points on which he would probably have desired to speak most clearly; but it seems to us that Dr. Robinson has on this point unduly wrested or strained his expressions. Because, in a passage of his 'Demonstratio Evangelica,' Eusebius mentions the concourse of pilgrims to the Mount of Olives without naming the Holy Sepulchre, Dr. Robinson infers that there was no definite tradition respecting the latter. But it is the same and not another writer who treats of the Sepulchre in the 'Life of Constantine,' and we can scarcely suppose that he would have allowed so grave a contradiction to remain, had he felt it to be a contradiction. When, to account for his silence, it is urged that a heathen temple stood on the spot, Dr. Robinson rejects the plea by asking why he did not speak of the horror thus excited. (Later Biblical Researches, p. 256.) But this method, hard as it might press even upon more accurate historians, seems quite inapplicable to so unsystematic a writer as Eusebius. Confining ourselves to his narrative of the discovery, we feel sure that the divine and miraculous intervention was manifested, according to his belief, not in guiding Constantine to an unknown site, but in preserving the cave with its sepulchre uninjured. There is no perplexity, there are no random efforts. A particular spot is at once selected, and there the discovery is made. Nor can we see that any doubt is betrayed by the expression that impious men had tried to bury the site in darkness and oblivion. It would at best imply no more than that the tradition had been stronger than their efforts.

Thus far then we can only infer that the traditions of heathen temples marking sacred sites in Jerusalem, are inconclusive, while at the same time the proceedings of Constantine betray no uncertainty as to the position of the sepulchral cave. To

* M. de Vogüé, admitting that written or material proofs of a continuous tradition are almost wholly wanting, lays great stress on the moral proofs (yet the application seems a dangerous one) that the Christian Church speedily numbered a large number of converts whose reverence for the holy sites would only be quickened and intensified by persecution, and that the efforts of the one side to obliterate, of the other to preserve the sacred sites, would be the surest guarantee of their authenticity. The argument would come with more force if there were any trace of *local* sanctity in the New Testament. Of reverence for relics there is abundant proof in the Acts of the Apostles, but these are always personal, not local. (De Vogüé, p. 30.)

prove that this cave, so laid bare, is the rock Sakrah, it is needful to show not only that the latter is a sepulchral excavation, but that the commonly accepted site is not. Anything short of this negative conclusion leaves the balance of probabilities in favour of the latter. But that the reputed site does contain a rock-hewn tomb has, we think, been proved beyond all possibility of question by Professor Willis, in his 'Architectural History of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.'* Any objections drawn from inconsistencies between that site and the expressions in the Gospels, can stand only if the present state of the cave represents substantially its original condition. But it has confessedly undergone an indefinite amount of alteration from the days of Constantine onwards. To separate it from the surrounding rock and cover the mound, so left, with costly marbles, was naturally the first step of those who sought to honour the sacred tomb. The mistaken devotion of later ages, which Ultramontanists have lamented not less than Protestants, has mutilated the interior in their zeal to adorn it. But there is nothing, even in its present state, which in any way contradicts the narrative of the Passion, and much that bears it out. Yet more, the building in which it stood was demolished, first by the Persians, and more systematically by the order of Hakem. Every effort was made to destroy the Sepulchre, both within and without, by iron hammers and by fire.† But the Khubbet-es-Sakrah has escaped uninjured, and the rock exhibits no sign of having undergone such treatment. This difference in its history would serve at once to distinguish it from the cave discovered by Constantine, even if it were not proved, as Professor Willis has shown, that the excavation under the Sakrah can never have been a sepulchre.‡

The identity of the Church of the Anastasis with the Mosque of Omar must be tested chiefly by its agreement or discrepancy with the statements of Eusebius. Mr. Fergusson maintains that the architecture of the Khubbet-es-Sakrah with that of the Golden Gateway, can belong only to the age of Constantine.

* See Williams' 'Holy City,' vol. ii. ch. iii.

† 'Architectural History of the Holy Sepulchre.' Ap. Williams' 'Holy City,' vol. ii. p. 180.

‡ Ibid., p. 196, &c. It is singular that the spot on which Mr. Fergusson has fixed as the tomb of our Lord, should furnish strong grounds for believing it to be the drain of the great altar of sacrifice which stood without the temple, whether of Solomon or of Herod. On this rock, during the Latin kingdom, stood the high altar of the Knights Templars. For a different reason, it has been not less reverenced by the Mahometans.

He also maintains that the description of Eusebius answers to these two buildings, and does not answer to any others. But, if it were otherwise, it would, he thinks, only show that the documentary and archæological evidence was contradictory, and that the former must yield to the latter. That such a contradiction may not unfrequently be discovered, it is impossible to deny. The controversy is not yet ended which on documentary evidence assigns the nave of Waltham Abbey to the last Saxon king of England, while on that of its architecture the building is asserted to belong to the succeeding century. But such contradictions relate to the form and character, and not to the site of a building.

According to Mr. Fergusson's view, Constantine raised two entirely distinct edifices:—1, the round Church of the Resurrection; 2, the Basilica or Martyrium: the latter destroyed utterly by the Caliph Hakem, the former still containing the genuine Sepulchre of Christ. But the words of Eusebius do not warrant the existence of any round church over the Holy Sepulchre. That site he does indeed call 'the head of the 'whole work;' but he says simply that the Emperor adorned it as such with choice columns and the most abundant decoration. The cave (*ἄντρον*) thus adorned opened into an extensive hypæthral court, which was surrounded by cloisters on all sides except the one facing the entrance to the cave, for on the side exactly opposite to the cave (*i. e.* looking east) was attached the Basilica, a splendid and lofty structure. This description it seems impossible to reconcile with Mr. Fergusson's hypothesis, or with his restored plan of the edifices of Constantine. (Essay, Plate VI.) When Eusebius says that he adorned the cave with pillars, the only legitimate inference is, that the mound left, after cutting away the sepulchre from the original rock, was encased and surrounded with columns, thus forming a small structure in a large court. It leaves no room for any supposition that the Sepulchre was contained in a separate building, or that it had more than one entrance. It is enshrined and decorated as a relic; but its magnitude is as nothing when compared with that of the Basilica, which Eusebius distinctly calls *τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς ἀναστάσεως*, thus setting aside the distinction which Mr. Fergusson draws between the dome of Omar as the Anastasis, and the Basilica as the Martyrium. We believe also that the words of Eusebius exclude the idea that the Sepulchre stood in a Rotunda, and lead us to infer that the cloistered court was apsidal towards the west. But however this may be, his statement is most explicit that the Basilica faced the side which was *exactly opposite* (*καταντικρύ*)

the entrance to the Sepulchre. Eusebius was an eye-witness. On a point like this he must have been speaking either truth or deliberate falsehood. No love of declamation, or superstition, or religious zeal, can account for an untruth (if it be one) which would compel us to reject the whole of his description. Now Mr. Fergusson finds two buildings (the mosque, namely, of Omar and the Golden Gateway), of which he takes the one to be the actual sepulchral church, the other to be the entrance to the Atrium of the Basilica. With these data, he is compelled to draw up his restored plan of the latter, of which the axis deviates slightly from that of the Gateway. But the western end of the Basilica, so far from being precisely opposite to the Sepulchre, does not even face any side of the Khubbet-es-Sakrah whatever. In fact, the northernmost side of the latter, if subtended eastwards, would give a parallel line running nearly one hundred feet distant from the south side of the Basilica. That the Dome of the Rock could ever have stood in an extensive court, having the Basilica exactly opposite to its eastern side, is therefore an absolute impossibility; and Mr. Fergusson in his plan has not introduced this court at all.

But the present sepulchre stands in a rotunda, and the Khubbet-es-Sakrah is also a rotunda. If the former be worth anything as a tradition, must it not show that in the time of Constantine it stood also under a rotunda? By a singular chance, the plan of the present Church of the Sepulchre furnishes remarkable evidence that it did not. More than half the aisle of the present rotunda is bounded by a concentric wall, in which are placed three small apses, one at the west end, the others on the north and south. If the design of the original church had been round, the northern and southern apse must have had their axis on the diametral line of the rotunda; but this line falls somewhat to the east of both these apses: and indeed the most hasty examination of the plan of the existing church will satisfy any one that the western end, with its three apses, could not possibly have formed part of any circular design.* Thus the present plan strictly corroborates the description of Eusebius, and explains the fact that a circular design is mentioned first by the pilgrim Arculfus, who saw the

* Willis ('Architectural History,' in Williams's 'Holy City,' vol. ii. p. 203.), who is followed by M. de Vogüé, p. 147. It is greatly to be regretted that neither Professor Willis nor Mr. Fergusson should have personally examined the localities of which they treat. The novelty of his hypothesis would appear to have laid a greater obligation on the latter to test on the spot an opinion which in such case he would probably have seen reason to modify or abandon.

church soon after its restoration by Modestus, to whom therefore the substitution of the rotunda must be attributed.

Finally, after some confused and inflated description, we come to another plain topographical statement, in which it is impossible that Eusebius could have been unconsciously mistaken. Whatever may have been the size or magnificence of the atrium on which he expends so much of his rhetoric, we must either accept without question, or reject his unequivocal statement, that the propylæa of the building opened upon the very middle of the great market-place. But the Golden Gateway opens on the Valley of Jehoshaphat, and, if it be the propylæum in question, convicts Eusebius of an absolute and impossible falsehood, whereas the east end of the present church actually opens on a street of deserted bazaars, and on a spot where still are seen the ruins of a Roman portico.

Putting aside, therefore, all questions as to the Sepulchre itself, — on two points, at least, of the last importance that the west end, namely, of the Basilica lay precisely east of the only entrance to the cave, and that the propylæa opened into the midst of a wide market-place), the language of Eusebius is hopelessly irreconcilable with the hypothesis of Mr. Fergusson; and unless his authority is to be absolutely rejected, the dome of the rock is not the original Church of the Anastasis, and cannot lie anywhere near it. Its architectural character, therefore, which impelled Mr. Fergusson to frame his theory, remains at the worst only a strange and perplexing difficulty. To attempt to solve it by altering the position of several of the most important sites in a city, by modifying or denying many (if not most) of the facts recorded about them, by resorting to changes of constant and serious interpolation, and by assuming the fraudulent transfer of one site, in favour of which nothing can be urged beyond its probability, is an alternative which, to say the least, should be adopted only in the last resort. We accept, without question, the statements of Eusebius, St. Jerome, or St. Cyril, when they relate plain facts of topography or history: we should accept similar statements with equal confidence from the most credulous pilgrim or the most superstitious chronicler, unless there were other reasons for doubting their veracity. But if Eusebius says that a Basilica stood precisely to the east of a sepulchre, and we place it so as not to face that sepulchre at all, we may be free to reject his statement, but we cannot consistently quote his testimony even for the commonest matters of fact. If again we say that a building which clearly exists substantially in its original condition, is actually a structure which is stated to have been destroyed first by an invading

army, and again by a fanatical caliph, we cannot use for any other purposes a history which manifestly must be a mere tissue of fraud and falsehood. Yet Mr. Fergusson maintains that the Khubbet-es-Sakrah retains even its original ceiled roof uninjured, although the Church of Constantine was thrown down by the Persians of Khosroes, and the restored building still more completely ruined by the order of Hakem.

To us it appears that Mr. Fergusson has magnified the difficulties presented by the architectural forms both of the Golden Gateway and of the Mosque of Omar. It is even easier to account for the latter than for the former, which (as Mr. Fergusson has remarked) is evidently a Roman portal, intended not for defence, but as an entrance to a religious building. He has himself noticed 'the almost classical forms and proportions' of the external pillars, and probably they may with good reason be ascribed to the temple of Herod.* In the Mosque of Omar his perplexities have been caused chiefly by the circular form of the building, by the heavy entablature supporting the discharging pointed arches of the inner aisle, and by the ceiled roofing. No Mahometan mosque, he says, was ever built in an octagonal or circular form, and even tombs of this shape are found only in India, while the other features precisely characterise the Byzantine architecture of the time of Constantine. The whole building, both within and without, presents indeed one uniform and harmonious design. In its interior, at least, Mr. Fergusson sees indubitable evidence of its Constantinian origin, while to us it seems not less strange that any can examine it without discerning the strongest Saracenic influence. But we believe that the argument drawn from Mahometan usage elsewhere is a fallacious and dangerous one. General usage cannot furnish conclusive evidence against an exception, if this be one. The preservation of any isolated relic or monument naturally suggests an octagonal or circular structure, and the dome of Omar was clearly designed to preserve the rock which almost fills its area. And it may not be irrelevant to remark, that there existed already in the same city a round building, designed also to enshrine a cave. The rotunda of Modestus had been completed half a century before Ab dal Malek commenced his mosque (assuming for the moment that it is his work;) nor is it unlikely that that structure may have guided the design of the Caliph, although we do not see that either Mr. Williams or M. de Vogüé have

* Mr. Williams (Holy City, vol. ii. p. 355, &c.) thinks that it may be identified with the Beautiful Gate mentioned in the third chapter of the Acts of the Apostles.

noticed this fact, while replying to Mr. Fergusson. The argument from the form of the entablature might have had more force, if Mr. Fergusson had not himself employed it to prove the arcades of the mosque el Aksa to be Saracenic. In that building the Byzantine columns support a wooden architrave on which rest highly stilted pointed arches, of the most uncouth and barbarous character, betraying, it would seem, the very infancy of that style from which sprung the sumptuous mosques and splendid palaces of Egypt and Spain. In the dome of the Rock the entablature and arches are encumbered with a lavish profusion of ornament, and with the elegant capitals (approaching nearly to Corinthian) display an intermixture of Byzantine and Saracenic influences. A cornice, of Saracenic character, runs round the inner aisle above the pier arches of the dome.

The likelihood of such commingling influences is borne out by a singular agreement of the Arabian traditions and chroniclers*, who affirm that Abd al Malek gathered together the most skilful workmen from all parts of his dominions. It is almost needless to remark, that at no time have the followers of the Prophet shown reluctance to employ Christian architects and workmen in their structures; and in this instance the amount of influence so exercised seems to be not much greater than that of Byzantine art over the buildings of the Crusaders. The only remaining question is, whether Ab dal Malek's work extended to the completion of the dome, which, Mr. Fergusson admits, is of 'pure 'Mahometan architecture, and is known to have been erected, or 'at least thoroughly repaired, by Sultan Solyman the Second, 'one of the Mahometan rulers of Constantinople.' Mr. Fergusson does not state his authorities, but M. de Vogüé, who (p. 291.) attributes the ornamentation of the dome to Sultan Selim in the sixteenth century, has done good service by inserting in his work the description of this building by John of Wurzburg, who saw it while it was used as a church by the Knights Templars (*i. e.* previous to the year 1187). His account so accurately describes the present dome, as well as the rest of the building, that we cannot refrain from transcribing the portions bearing immediately upon it:—

'Between the exterior wall and the inner range of columns (which, all of marble, to the number of twelve, separated by four squared piers, support the interior and smaller wall) there is a range of sixteen columns, and of eight square marble piers. It supports a roof which joins the interior to the external wall, and a ceiling adorned with beautiful compartments. Above this wall, and of a narrower

* Williams's 'Holy City,' vol. ii. p. 111.

diameter, rises in the air a spherical cupola, painted internally, and covered without by plates of lead, and crowned by the Cross which the Christians have placed on the highest point of the building.'* (*Les Eglises de la Terre Sainte*, p. 286.)

We have thus tested Mr. Fergusson's theory before entering on any other topics, not merely because his admirable chapters on Eastern Art, in his Handbook of Architecture, have imparted to his judgment on all cognate points a special weight, but because it would have been useless to speak of the various edifices which have succeeded each other on the site of the Holy Sepulchre, while an hypothesis had been left unnoticed, which denied not only the genuineness of the site, but the fact that Constantine had raised any building either on or near it. This assumption, in fact, removes the basis of any such investigation; for we have seen that the round church was first raised by Modestus, while the apse still proves incontestably the existence of an older building which was not round, and which, from that very circumstance, answers to the description of Eusebius. That building must have been of the age of Constantine, if it were not (and it could not be) earlier; and if so, what could it be but the Martyrium of the Resurrection? †

* M. de Vogüé says that the shafts of the columns (of precious marbles) vary in length and thickness, and are evidently spoils from ancient buildings, probably from the ruins of the Temple of Herod. (P. 277.) There is no evidence of this in the elevations and sketches of Messrs. Arundale and Catherwood. (Fergusson's 'Essay,' frontispiece and Plate I.) As in the case of the Mosque el Aksa, we greatly need a more accurate survey of the building. It may perhaps be doubted whether the Knights Templars adopted the practice of building round churches more from a desire of imitating the Rotunda of Modestus, than of reproducing the dome of Abd al Malek. Professor Willis (in Williams's 'Holy City,' vol. ii. p. 278.) confines it to the former.

† We have said nothing of the Mosque el Aksa, because with regard to this building we need further information before we can determine many points now wholly uncertain. Although, since M. de Vogüé's departure, the tolerance of Kiamil Pacha has permitted ingress to many Christian travellers, their admission has not added much to our knowledge. It seems impossible to reconcile Mr. Catherwood's plan with Mr. Arundale's view of the mosque, both given in Mr. Fergusson's Essay (Plates II. and V.). Little more, it would seem, can as yet be affirmed, than that the description of Procopius can be applied to no other building, and that it applies in a very remarkable way to this; that the interior exhibits a very rude and barbarous Saracenic design; and that little of the edifice of Justinian remains besides the columns, the capitals of which have been encased

The preceding remarks were written before Mr. Fergusson's article on the Topography of Jerusalem, in Dr. Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible,' was placed in our hands. That article, in our judgment, calls for a still stronger protest than his previous essay;* and we cannot but lament that the 'Dictionary of the Bible' (which is in so many respects a most important contribution to our literature), should stand committed to a theory which, as we believe, transgresses the most important canons of historical criticism, and enwraps the whole subject in a maze of bewildering difficulties. Mr. Fergusson's more recent summary is in substance the same with his 'Essay,' and where it differs, it differs, we think, in a less scrupulous assumption of facts and distortion of authorities; and we can only confess our astonishment that, in an attempt to remodel the topography of Jerusalem, and re-write its modern history, he should impute to his opponents 'various hypotheses to 'explain away the admitted difficulties of the case,' and upbraid them with indulging in 'continued appeals to faith,' and in 'personal arguments.' For ourselves we can but deny the imputation. We have no hypothesis to support; we have made no appeals to faith; we have not brought forward a single personal argument. We have simply examined a mass of historical and architectural evidence, with every essential feature of which we have shown that Mr. Fergusson's theory stands out in the most complete and glaring contradiction. Until these contradictions are fairly met (and his recent article meets none of them) we cannot hold ourselves bound to answer the few additional difficulties which he now urges. We will, however, attempt to show in a few words that in urging them he has only added to his own. Without dwelling on his first position, that 'the circumstances of the locality should accord with those of the Bible narrative,' further than to repeat that that narrative furnishes no conclusive evidence for deter-

in coarse reticulated work, which by its bulge would betray the fact of concealment, even if the volutes and part of the abacus had not been left peering out above it. (Fergusson's 'Essay,' p. 109.; Williams's 'Holy City,' vol. ii. p. 306.) A capital of similar design, from the entrance court of the Church of the Sepulchre, is figured by M. de Vogüé (p. 172.). Of the five arches in the colonnade before the Mosque el Aksa, three are unmistakably Romanesque, and must have been added by the Crusaders while the building was occupied as a royal palace. It still retains pointed roofs externally; a strong proof that the building, under the parts so roofed, must have been originally Byzantine.

mining the topography, and that the genuineness of the site, and the position of the church, are two distinct questions,— we must at once maintain that he states what is not correct in fact, when he affirms that the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre is 'wholly of an age subsequent to that of the Crusades, 'and without a trace of the style of Constantine.' Not only do other portions of the building exhibit evidence of earlier work, but the arrangement of the apsidal terminations proves indisputably the existence of an original building which had *no* rotunda; and the lower portions of these apsidal walls belong as certainly to this earliest design. M. de Vogüé's discovery of a portion of the atrium may not be known to Mr. Fergusson; but (to say the least) it presents a formidable difficulty to his theory, while it corroborates as remarkably the statements of Eusebius. But when he affirms that the Mosque of Omar 'possesses in its centre a mass of living rock with one cave in 'it, exactly as described by Eusebius,' while the present church has only a 'small tabernacle where no rock ever was seen by 'human eyes,' we confess that his words seem to us beyond the reach of criticism. Eusebius says nothing of a rock extending 'over the whole central area of the church:' his words utterly overthrow any such supposition. And Mr. Fergusson ignores the difficulty that the Sakrah never could have contained a sepulchral cave, and that its present condition is in entire contradiction with the history of the Sepulchre; while his other assertion can only stand by convicting Fabri of falsehood, when he affirms that in 1480 he found the wall which is opposite to the entrance of the Angel Chapel, and in which the little door of the Sepulchre is formed, to be a naked rock, in one piece, without joints, and still showing the marks of tools. (Willis, ap. Williams's 'Holy City,' vol. ii. p. 186.) His theory indeed involves nothing less than a miracle, for his cave and tomb remain uninjured, while of the other (to say nothing of the mutilations which it suffered at the hands of Khosroes and the successors of Haroun al Raschid) we learn from a contemporary historian that the agents of Hakem 'endeavoured to break in 'pieces even the hollow tomb of the Sepulchre with iron ham-'mers,' and then tried to destroy it by fire.

Mr. Fergusson endeavours in vain to establish a continuous tradition for the genuineness of the site of the Sepulchre. It is impossible to trace its existence to a time anterior to the destruction of Jerusalem; and this, when taken together with the total absence of all *local* sanctity in the New Testament, absolutely precludes our attaching any force to a tradition which probably does not belong to the first century.

But it is still more strange that Mr. Fergusson finds proof for his theory in the statement of Eusebius, which he thus translates: 'On the very spot that witnessed our Saviour's sufferings a new Jerusalem was constructed *over against* the one so celebrated of old, which, since the foul stain of guilt brought on it by the murder of the Lord, has experienced the last extremity of desolation. It was *opposite* this city that the emperor began to rear a monument of our Saviour's victory over death, with rich and lavish magnificence.' We can only suppose that Mr. Fergusson has misunderstood the very words which he has emphasized, and that he believes Eusebius to assert that the work of Constantine was raised opposite to the *New Jerusalem* (i. e. on the hill of the Temple). The meaning of Eusebius is precisely contrary; and the passage positively affirms that his church was built on the hill exactly opposite to that on which stands the Mosque of Omar; and a comparison of this passage with another in Socrates (Historia Ecclesiastica, vol. i. pp. 17, 15.), will also show that by the words *New Jerusalem* he actually meant to designate the Martyrium of the Anastasis itself.

If, in his zeal to show that the so-called Mosque of Omar is not the work of Abd al Malek, he has omitted to account for the magnificent building which indubitably was reared by that caliph, but which, according to his theory, must in some strange way have disappeared, he is not more fortunate in his efforts to claim as an authority on his side the pilgrim Arculfus, who visited Jerusalem eight years before that work was begun. Assuming that the dome of the Rock 'was certainly then, as it 'is now, the most conspicuous and the most important building 'in Jerusalem,' he concludes that Arculfus describes it under the designation of the Church of the Sepulchre. Now the dome of the Rock has a diameter of nearly eighty feet; over nearly fifty feet of this diameter projects the rock to a height varying from six to ten feet, covered by nothing but the gigantic dome which soars above it. Contrast with this the words of Arculfus, that in the middle of the Round Church is situated a 'round cabin (tegurium) cut out of a single piece of rock, within 'which there is space for *nine* men to stand and pray,' and all further comment becomes superfluous. Of his crowning assumption of a transference of the site from one hill to another, we will only cite his own words that *no record* exists to attest it. Finally, Eusebius says that Constantine raised one building, which he calls τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς ἀναστάσεως: Mr. Fergusson says that he raised two, one the Martyrium, the other the Anastasis. Eusebius says that the Sepulchre was *precisely west*

of the Basilica, and on the same axis both with it as well as with the atrium and propylæa: Mr. Fergusson ignores each of these statements. Eusebius says that the propylæa opened on a market-place: Mr. Fergusson identifies the propylæa with the Golden Gateway, which he admits has a slightly different axis even from the atrium, and which opens on the valley of Jehoshaphat, where a market-place, to use the words of Professor Willis, is 'ludicrously impossible.' Eusebius says that the Sepulchre stood in an extensive court: of which Mr. Fergusson takes no notice whatever. All records affirm that the work of Constantine was more or less mutilated by the Persians in the seventh century, and after the death of Haroun al Raschid in the ninth, and that it was nearly destroyed by Hakem in the eleventh: Mr. Fergusson maintains that the Church of the Sepulchre has escaped all injury, and retains even its ceiled roofing unmutilated. While these contradictions remain — with a mass of other difficulties — unnoticed and unrefuted, the whole burden of proof must rest on Mr. Fergusson. We are not bound to refute assumptions, or even evidence brought forward to support a theory which impugns known facts, ignores archæological testimony, and contradicts the historical records connected with the subject for fifteen hundred years.

Throughout we have examined the question strictly in accordance with the canons of historical criticism, and have kept out of sight every consideration of the cogency of local traditions, of the sanctity of sites, and of the violence which would be done to the most cherished associations, if Mr. Fergusson's theory should be proved to be correct. But we can avow no sympathy with the school which eagerly seizes on every plea for discrediting a given tradition or uprooting a given association; and we are ready to acknowledge that to us the more religious temper of men who seek rather to believe than to reject, appears altogether preferable. The warmth of their devotion, and the earnestness of their religious prepossessions, may impel them to accept a site as genuine on slender and insufficient evidence, or to discern a miracle where others may perceive none. But so long as they examine fairly and dispassionately the evidence of written records, whether they bear for or against their own premisses, as long as they do not distort or run counter to their statements, the historical faculty in them has received no serious injury, while the sceptical disposition, as such, assuredly, does not carry with it its own consolation. This critical fairness is, we think, manifested in no ordinary degree throughout the pages of M. de Vogüé. A zealous Roman Catholic, he never disavows the strength of his religious emotions, and his own personal

interest in the genuineness of the sites which he visits; but we do not think that he has availed himself of any inadmissible evidence in the attempt to prove it. Thus he labours hard to show that Eusebius must have been aware of the Invention of the Cross, as well as of the Recovery of the Sepulchre, because so important a spot as that of Golgotha must have attracted his attention, and also that of Constantine. But he does not attempt to say that Eusebius mentions the miraculous discovery of the instruments of the Passion. The value of his work depends chiefly on those chapters in which he has not gone over the same ground with Professor Willis in his Architectural History of the Holy Sepulchre. So nearly indeed are they agreed on the various transformations which the Sepulchre and the buildings about it have undergone, that a considerable portion of M. de Vogüé's labour becomes a superfluous repetition: and in the few points in which he differs from Professor Willis, the latter, if he be in error, errs from a far closer adherence to the expressions of his authorities. But M. de Vogüé may claim the merit of original research in the general archæology of Palestine, and thus of supplying omissions in Professor Willis's treatise as well as of bringing to light the extent and character of the Latin work in the Holy Land. This latter subject he has examined with a fulness and accuracy which deserves very high praise, and which goes far towards settling several disputed points with regard to the influence which Greek, Latin, and Saracenic art have exercised over each other.

If the earliest form of the buildings round the Holy Sepulchre is too much a matter of speculation, the church of Bethlehem, of which M. de Vogüé gives a most valuable history and description, possesses an interest of another kind, in the character of its architecture, while it also illustrates the original arrangements of the church of the Resurrection.* Whether the nave be or be not of the same date with the apsidal terminations of the church, it is unquestionably a work which can belong only to the time

* M. de Vogüé regards the site of this church as the most certain of all the sacred localities of Palestine. He naturally lays great stress on the fact that it is mentioned, in no doubtful tone, by Justin the Martyr; and, undoubtedly, a record which carries the tradition back to the early part of the second century, is deserving of attention. The testimony of Origen, of Eusebius, and of Jerome is obviously of no value except as preserving the tradition handed down by Justin. Whether the grotto be or be not the scene of the Nativity, there can be no question as to the cave in which Jerome dwelt for thirty years. We will only refer to Dr. Stanley's examination of the evidence for and against the site. 'Sinai and Palestine,' p. 436, &c.

of Constantine or Justinian. It is not likely that the hosts of Khosroes, which threw down the Basilica at Jerusalem, should have wholly spared so rich a structure as the Church of the Nativity: but the havoc could not have gone further than the destruction of the roof and marbles of the interior, with the demolition of the atrium. The nave retains its magnificent arcade of eleven bays (with monolithic Corinthian columns, supporting a horizontal architrave), flanked by double aisles. The transepts (of the same height and width as the nave) are terminated to the north and south by apses, which spring immediately from the outer walls of the nave-aisles. These aisles are continued beyond the transepts with arches of larger span, the inner for two bays, and the two outer aisles for one bay, each ending in right-angled terminations, beyond which an apse (similar in dimensions to those of the transepts) closes the choir. The arrangement of the three apses (excepting that the connecting portions are squared in the one instance, and rounded in the other) is similar to that of the apses in the outer wall of the Holy Sepulchre, and is illustrated further by the plans of some small churches of the fourth and even of the third century, which are found at the entrance of catacombs at Rome. These churches, although extremely diminutive, have, as M. de Vogüé remarks, precisely the same arrangement of apses as the church at Bethlehem, and even the squared wall which connects them. (P. 116.) At Bethlehem again, as in the Church of the Sepulchre, we have the same design of a large atrium opening by three grand portals into the nave of the Basilica. The roof is of open timber work, and, although modern, cannot have replaced a vault: and as there are no arches at the intersection of the transepts and nave, the design could not have comprised a cupola. All this, taken together, furnishes strong evidence that the church cannot belong to the age of Justinian, and must therefore belong to that of Constantine. In the churches of the former, the cupola is either the absorbing feature of the whole design, or greatly modifies the arrangement of the surrounding parts. Nor are we justified in drawing a distinction between the nave and the rest of the building, for the crypt (on account of which the church was raised) runs under the greater part of the choir, and 'proves, if we admit the antiquity of the nave, 'that the original could not have differed much from the exist-'ing choir.' (P. 54.) Eusebius ascribes to Constantine a church built over the cave of the Nativity as distinctly as the one raised over the Sepulchre, and describes both alike as great and splendid edifices. The pilgrim of Bordeaux says of Bethlehem as of the Sepulchre, 'Ibi Basilica facta est jussu Constantini.'

The same fact is recorded by the historians Socrates and Sozomen. St. Jerome, speaking of the funeral of Paula, says that amongst a crowd of worshippers her body was placed, first, in the midst of the church, and, three days later, in the crypt below,—thus clearly proving the large dimensions of the Basilica. A worthless and self-refuting legend in the annals of Eutychius ascribes the building to Justinian, while the total silence of Procopius proves conclusively that that emperor could not have built a church which the historian must otherwise have mentioned as amongst the most splendid of his structures. In the inroad of the Persians it escaped with the loss of its roofs and its marbles. From the fury of Hakem it was delivered, as the legend says, by a blaze of light, which struck down the spoilers to the earth, or (as M. de Vogüé here ventures to suggest) by the gold of the Christians, which dazzled their eyes and gratified their avarice. The large space of wall between the arcades of the nave and the windows of the clerestory still exhibits faded fragments of the mosaics, which once adorned the whole of it. The roof with its bare rafters forms but a poor covering for a building so magnificent. The recent date of this roof is well ascertained, although there is good reason for thinking that the original roof was not a vault, and that it was not less rich than the church which it covered.* The walls of the aisles were encased in brilliant marbles, if we may believe the testimony of Quaresmius, a pilgrim of the seventeenth century, who says that he still saw some of the slabs, as well as the fastenings of others which had been torn down. But whether the blank wall below the clerestory was thus decorated in the original design, is a question to which probably no answer can be given. It is only certain that the mosaics which remain belong to a later age, and that they stand a shattered memorial of the short and hollow reconciliation between the Greeks and Latins, when the arms of the Crusaders had purged the sanctuary from Mahometan pollution.

To these mosaics the church at Bethlehem owes no small portion of its interest. The inscriptions attached to them illustrate the strange readiness with which the Crusaders passed from the carnage of battle to the decrees of councils,—from the sack of cities and the torturing of women and children, to the work of theological reconciliation. It is no slight advantage

* Eusebius says that the roof of Constantine's Basilica at Jerusalem had carved compartments, suspended over the nave like a vast and brilliant sea of gold. It is probable that the Church of Bethlehem had a cradle-roof similarly decorated. (De Vogüé, p. 53.)

that the mosaics furnish conclusive evidence of their date. Throughout, Latin influence is plainly discernible, while the workmanship is Byzantine, and the majority of the inscriptions are Greek. The whole work was under the direction of the Latin bishop of Bethlehem; but no small part of the cost was defrayed by the ambiguous friendship of Manuel Comnénus. The inscriptions have suffered greatly from time and injuries: but, availing himself of the work of Quaresmius, who transcribed all that were uninjured in his day, M. de Vogüé has been enabled to fill up many gaps in the fragments still remaining. The most important mosaics exhibit a series of architectural designs, containing each the decrees of a council. On the north side are memorials of the councils of Ancyra, Antioch, Sardica, Gangra, Laodicæa, and Carthage: on the south, the six councils commonly known as œcumenical, together with the second council of Nicæa. In the examination of these subjects, M. de Vogüé naturally sees evidence for the dogma of Papal Supremacy, even where, as in the council of Sardica, facts would appear to warrant a very different conclusion. But he is more happy in his discrimination of the share which Latins and Greeks severally bore in the work of decoration.

'In spite of numerous Latin inscriptions, we cannot fail of seeing in the choice and treatment of the subjects, evident characteristics of Byzantine work. The representation of councils, and especially of the seven œcumenical councils, is a subject altogether Greek. It is never found in the churches of the West, while in those of the East examples of it are common enough. . . . The *nimbus* given to prophets and personages of the Old Testament, the Byzantine form adopted for the architectural designs, the words placed in the mouth of the Sibyl, belong to Greek iconography. At the same time, the Latin influence is evident, not merely in many Latin inscriptions mingled with the Greek, but in several iconographical details. Thus the attitude of benediction is Latin, — a usage unknown in Greek painting; and the œcumenical councils themselves are not represented according to the rules of the "Guide to Painting," or as they exist still in the churches of Mount Athos. In these are depicted the chief members of the council. The emperor presides surrounded by saints, priests, and pontiffs, of whom one acts as secretary. The Holy Spirit hovers above, inspiring the fathers of the council, while devils seated on their shoulders blind and captivate the heresiarchs. Here, on the contrary, all the portraits have disappeared, while the texts alone remain.' (*Les Eglises de la Terre Sainte*, p. 87.)

The date of these mosaics is determined not merely by the statements of Johannes Phocas (quoted by Leo Allatius, a Greek of the seventeenth century, who dedicated his works to Louis XIV.), but by an inscription in the western apse, of which

great part is still extant, and the lost parts are restored from the copy given by Quaresmius. Of this inscription M. de Vogüé remarks, that it closely resembles those of the nave. 'Its general 'character, the form of the letters, its ligatures, are identical, and 'would alone be enough to prove that the inscriptions of the nave 'are of the twelfth century, and that the whole decoration of the 'church is the work of the Crûsaders.' These decorations were yet fresh when the Latin kingdom was overthrown. From that time the history of the Church of Bethlehem has been a series of disasters, only less severe than those which have befallen the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. In the fifteenth century, the roof, already decayed or damaged, was rebuilt with funds sent by Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, while Edward IV. of England contributed the lead for the exterior. In the seventeenth, extensive repairs were carried out by the Greek clergy, who had displaced the Latins in the possession of the church. Restored to the latter in 1690, in 1788 it again passed into the hands of the Greeks, who still continue to occupy it. M. de Vogüé laments, with reason, the more barbarous 'restorations' of 1842. Fragments of mosaics (and not many of them remained) were covered with plaister: a blank wall was raised all round the choir, within which enclosure the Greeks celebrate their offices, while the nave is abandoned to lounging smokers, screaming children, the merchandise of hucksters, and the horses of vagrant Bedouins.

M. de Vogüé thinks that if the Church of the Holy Sepulchre had undergone fewer transformations, Mr. Fergusson's theory could not have been propounded. At the least, it could not have been supported by the break in its history caused by the ravages of the Persian invasion. It would have been a happier circumstance for this controversy, if the Church of the Sepulchre had retained more than the foundation walls of the buildings anterior to Modestus. The Basilica of Bethlehem has experienced a better fortune: but the fact is certain, that before the round buildings of Modestus a church stood here, with a semicircular termination which could not belong to a rotunda. If this church was anterior to the destruction by Khosroes, it must have belonged either to the age of Constantine or that of Justinian; and there is not the slightest evidence that the latter raised any building near this spot. That the words of Eusebius contradict Mr. Fergusson's hypothesis on at least two vital points, in which they singularly correspond with the commonly received site, we have seen already. But when from his description we proceed to reconstruct the original edifice, the task is less easy, and the result more uncertain. M. de Vogüé and Professor Willis, both

taking the same view, and both agreed as to the site of the church and its history, differ greatly in their plans, restored from the only extant authority on the subject. The arrangement of the apses (already spoken of) would appear to determine the width of the great court which enclosed the Sepulchre. The size and position of the atrium seems now to be ascertained, if a discovery made by M. de Vogüé should (as it seems probable) be correct. The street of the bazaars exhibits the remains of the propylæa; and their dimensions are in part determined by the fact that there remain not only the bases and shafts of four of the columns, but also the square pilaster which marks its southern angle. The fragment brought to light by M. de Vogüé in the court of the Coptic Convent fixes the north-western angle of the colonnade of the atrium. It is a large rectangular pier, on the southern and eastern sides of which are attached pilasters supporting the remains of highly ornamented arches at right angles to one another. On the northern is a simple pilaster, with the springing of a perfectly plain arch, which served evidently to connect the arcade with an outer wall. The details of this fragment,—its chamfered pilasters,—without capitals, but with a foliation of acanthus leaves running round the whole pier,—the oval and beaded mouldings of the arches, agree well with the forms of the fourth century. The spring of the arch proves its span to have been about sixteen feet, and the height of the piers is about fifteen, thus giving about thirty feet for the height of the portico, which thus corresponds with that of the propylæa.

In the plan of the Basilica and its relation to the western apse, M. de Vogüé differs from Professor Willis, except on almost the only fact stated unequivocally by Eusebius—that the nave was flanked by double aisles. For the rest, Eusebius states (1) that Constantine decorated the sacred cave, as the head of the whole work, (*τοῦ παντὸς ὥσπερ τινα κεφαλὴν*) with choice columns and great magnificence; (2) that from this he passed in order (*διέβαινεν ἑξῆς*) to a very large space open to the sky, which he paved with marble, and surrounded with colonnades on three sides; for (3) on the side exactly opposite the cave was attached the great Basilica; that (4) three splendid doors turned towards the rising sun admitted the crowd; and (5) opposite to these doors was the apse, the head of the whole work.

Arguing from these statements, Professor Willis holds that the Basilica was a distinct building, whose apse or western end was exactly east of the Sepulchre,—that the large open court in which the latter stood was formed by subtending the sides

from the base (still remaining) of the large western apse, and that the altar, surrounded by the twelve columns with silver capitals stood in the apse opposite to the entrance of the cave. M. de Vogüé, on the other hand, maintains that the court of the Sepulchre and the apse of the Basilica are one and the same, — that the nave and its aisles opened into a narrow transept, in the middle of which stood the altar with twelve columns, and that on the western side of this transept opened the three doors which Eusebius specially notices.* He cannot admit 'that the 'Basilica destined for the assembly of the faithful, and for the 'celebration of the Divine offices, was separated from the Holy 'Sepulchre, the very object for which it was raised. Indeed this 'disposition would be directly opposed to the aim of the founders 'of the building, and would moreover have shut out the court of 'the Sepulchre by the external wall of the apse of the Basilica, 'i. e. by a convex surface, — a combination especially un-'pleasing.' (P. 136.) To assert that the view of the Sepulchre from the high altar was the special aim of Constantine, is perhaps to assume too much. But M. de Vogüé's argument is slightly strengthened by the fact that Eusebius speaks of both the Sepulchre and the apse as the head of the whole work. On the other hand, his opinion reduces the very spacious court (*χῶρον παμμεγέθη*) into a very small one, — throws back the three great doors to the western end of the transept, and then compels him to assume the existence of six large portals (a fact respecting which the silence of Eusebius is very singular), — and to place the altar in the transept, when general usage would require the apse. Nor must we forget that Eusebius seems distinctly to affirm that the great doors were the entrances from the atrium into the Basilica, for he does not mention them until he has completed his description of the nave with its double aisles, and thus makes them stand at the east not of the great apse but of the nave. If again the apse of the court was also the apse of the Basilica, then the Sepulchre was *in* the Basilica, nor could it with truth be said that the latter exactly faced it, unless the word *νεὼς* is here taken to mean nave and aisles as distinct from choir — a meaning for which probably no authority can be

* The idea (which M. de Vogüé speaks of as the popular one) that the Court of the Sepulchre was placed on the side of, and was equal in length with, the Basilica, must be abandoned, for the same reason which renders Mr. Fergusson's hypothesis untenable. Eusebius states, with a clearness leaving no room for uncertainty, that the Court of the Sepulchre and the Basilica had both the same axis. Neither of these theories fulfils this essential condition.

found. At the same time it would be more logical to charge Eusebius with inaccuracy than to reject any architectural proof for M. de Vogüé's position. Such proof he discovers in the statement that some bases of capitals were visible in the ground level of the rotunda before the fire of 1808, and that his restored transept, or entrance to the apse, occupies precisely the position of the great piers of the modern rotunda.* To us it appears, from a comparison of the two plans, that every vestige of the three entrances, as he places them, must have been removed before the rotunda could be built; and that, if they occupied the place of the present large eastern piers, they must have stood, not at the base of the apse, but at the end of the nave and its two interior aisles. But such perplexities are of minor importance: and it is sufficient to admit, with Professor Willis, that 'the description of Eusebius is far too loose, imperfect, and 'untechnical to admit of certain interpretation into the accurate 'language of descriptive geometry.' And it is no small gain, that we have material proof for the more important localities of the atrium and its propylæa, which must serve as the basis for all inquiries connected with this building.

The account given by M. de Vogüé of the two churches which rose successively on the site of the Holy Sepulchre between the destruction by the Persians and the arrival of the Crusaders, although more detailed, is substantially the same with that of Professor Willis. From the description given by Arculfus, who visited Jerusalem in 680, we first learn that a rotunda had been substituted for the semicircular apse of Constantine, and that the various sacred sites were no longer comprised, as they had been, in one symmetrical design. We now have a group of four churches, (1) the Anastasis; (2) the Church of Golgotha: (3) of the Invention of the Cross; or, as it was now called, the Basilica of Constantine; and (4) the Church of the Blessed Virgin. Beyond these facts no definite conclusions can be drawn from the narrative of Arculfus. Extracted from him by Adamnanus at Iona, after his return, it has not even the merit of a memoir drawn up on the spot; and of the plan sketched from memory, we can only say that it is not wholly destitute of all resemblance to the places which it is intended to illustrate. There is enough to indicate the large apse of the former church with its three smaller apses; but

* We should be glad to know what authority there may be for this statement, for which he only refers to 'Mariti, Etat. Pres. de 'Jerusalem,' vol. viii. p. 1. (P. 143.)

there is little more. His written descriptions, however, are more full, and seem in many points more accurate.

For the third building raised (after the ravages of Hakem) by Constantine Monomachus, we have the description of another pilgrim, the monk Sœwulf, who visited the Holy City three years after the conquest by the Latins,—while, therefore, the design of Monomachus had not yet been modified by the splendid additions made to it by the Crusaders. The most important change in this third period was the throwing out (from the southern extremity of the original apse) of three chapels, of which the account given by Sœwulf is perfectly consistent with the modern plan of that portion of the church. (Willis, ap. Williams's 'Holy City,' vol. ii. p. 210.) For we must bear in mind that the Latins carefully abstained from interfering with the existing buildings beyond what the necessities of their design required. Their changes were confined to the removal of the eastern apse and entrances of the rotunda, together with the insignificant oratory raised over the Stone of Unction. They then proceeded to attach to the former edifice their beautiful Romanesque structure. From the southern court (at the angle formed with the northernmost of the three chapels of Constantine Monomachus, over which rose the great campanile, now a ruin,) the double doorway opened into the transepts, each of a single bay,—between which, on four great piers of square edges alternating with rounded shafts, rose a cupola on pendentives to the height of 110 feet. To the west the choir (of two bays under a single vault) is terminated by an apse with three radiating chapels. Our present purpose in no way calls upon us to describe at length the several portions of this edifice; and the admirable account of Professor Willis renders the task wholly unnecessary. But apart from any such strictly technical detail, there are subjects of wide and special interest which must not be passed by, and in which this splendid building may enable us to determine some important points whereon a definite judgment is greatly needed.

In the midst of an Eastern city, surrounded by purely Eastern associations, the Church of the Crusaders, rich with the forms of a foreign art, rises with a peculiar and melancholy majesty. Yet it was no exotic transplanted into a strange and uncongenial soil. In its new home, the architecture of the West has bowed to the necessities of climate, and availed itself of the grace and beauty exhibited in the art of the country which it had subdued, yet losing nothing of its ancient strength and dignity. It has found itself in a region of terraced roofs and soaring cupolas; and the high-pitched gables of Europe have at once been aban-

doned for the long level lines of Eastern edifices. The dome rises above arcades and portals with clustered shafts and deeply recessed and richly moulded arches. It has borrowed, where it desired them, the features and details both of Byzantine and Saracenic art, while yet it remained the creation of another land to which Byzantine and Saracenic art could never have given birth. By so doing it has been enabled to depart, in greater or less degree, from the traditions of the West; and its triforia and clerestories have assumed forms which would be strange to the churches of Teutonic Christendom. And this building, whose origin, it would seem, none could for an instant call in question, rises up in this distant land no solitary stranger, but one of a host of kindred buildings scattered throughout the temporary realm of the Crusaders. Nor can it boast of a beauty and a richness which is not shared, albeit in less degree, by many another Latin edifice in Palestine. They are buildings, again, which, more perhaps than any others, tell their own tale and relate their own history. If not a single written memorial had come down to us, we should have known that the whole series arose within the brief compass of three generations. The commencement of the eleventh century witnessed the establishment of the Latin kingdom, and before its close the successors of Godfrey and Baldwin were expelled, never to regain the power of raising like structures in the Holy Land. Yet the time was not too short to test the vitality of Western art. In the space of ninety years it might be so far modified by Eastern forms as to lose its own identity; or it might extend its influence over the land which it had invaded. Was it, then, more susceptible of Byzantine or Saracenic influence towards the close than it had been at the commencement of this period, or was it less? And, again, at this same time, the art which Rome bequeathed as an inheritance to Teutonic Christendom, was receiving a mighty impetus. Did the tide of the Crusades, as it was thrown back on Europe, carry with it any power to modify or hasten that great development? And is any portion of Teutonic art to be traced to the land where the Crusaders tore down the Crescent which had glistened on the dome of Omar's Mosque for more than four hundred years?

Of these important questions some have received little or no attention, none have been examined with anything like the fulness and care which M. de Vogüé has bestowed upon them. He is the first who may be said to have grasped the Latin archæology of Palestine as a *whole;* and the manner in which he has treated the history of Latin art from the time when it raised the Church of the Sepulchre to the period when it was

driven back to Cyprus, Rhodes, and Malta, is eminently satisfactory. But we doubt whether he has grasped as clearly the characteristics which distinguished the architecture of Teutonic Europe from all other forms, whether Romanesque, Byzantine, or Saracenic; and we think that his Gallicism has carried him too far when he asserts that to France alone are we to look as the birthplace of the architecture of our forefathers.

The point in which Latin art first underwent a modification in Palestine, is clearly the substitution of terraced roofs for high-pitched gables. If this change affected their designs externally, its influence internally is still more prominent. But we are quite at a loss to comprehend the difficulty under which M. de Vogüé supposes the Western architects to have laboured, or the special advantages of flattened ceilings. In the twelfth century he believes that the necessity for covering the triforium of a church with a lean-to roof was always an embarrassment in the internal treatment of the nave; that, if we suppose the triforium to be vaulted, the rafters of the outer roof must rest against the main wall at an elevation above the arcade of the triforium; and that thus a space of blank wall, not easy to treat satisfactorily, would be left between the triforium and the clerestory, the windows of which, thrust up towards the roof, would be dwarfed to a size quite disproportioned to the elevation of the church. This difficulty, he says, the Western architects tried to evade by all kinds of contrivances, yet without success. (P. 180.) It is indeed true that the substitution of flat roofs removes the difficulty; but we cannot see why there may not be other solutions of it, even if we retain vaulted triforia, which, after all, are very rare and exceptional. The splendid triforia of our own Romanesque churches are introduced without condemning the clerestory windows to the insignificant proportions which M. de Vogüé feelingly laments; nor do we think that the treatment of the triforium constitutes any special merit in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It is in fact an arcade nearly equal in height to the pier-arches below; and a clerestory window of very puny dimensions is inserted in the blank space between the triforium and the vault. We do not believe that the architects of the twelfth century experienced any difficulty in the matter; and if they had, we are sure that they would have devised more than one of the many remedies which readily suggest themselves. Elsewhere (p. 358.) he speaks of the triforium of the Church of the Sepulchre as the result of its vast proportions; and yet its clerestory windows are no better developed than those at Sebaste or Lydda. Later still (p. 378.), he specifies 'windows timidly pierced,' amongst details which the

Latins in Palestine borrowed from the usages of the country. The exaggerated triforium of the church at Jerusalem, and the diminutive windows which without triforia characterise the other churches of Palestine, are among their most prominent defects; and we regret that M. de Vogüé has striven with so much labour to prove them to be merits.*

But the Church of the Sepulchre is the only one of which the design was large enough to admit of any triforium. A more general instance of accommodation to foreign forms is the adoption of the pointed arch. A superficial view might lead us to suppose that the use of the round arch was the essential characteristic of all the Romanesque styles, as the pointed is supposed to be the distinguishing feature of the Gothic. But the buildings of the Crusaders, raised at a time when the use of the latter was, in Europe, altogether exceptional, exhibits an universal predominance of pointed forms; and it is only in later designs that we find a few examples of round arches. If, then, in spite of this adoption of pointed forms, the structures of the Crusaders remain, as will be seen, essentially Romanesque, and if they exhibit this character more prominently in the later than the earlier examples, it is at once clear that the traditions of the West were deserted not for the sake of a new development, but solely for the convenience of the workmen employed in their erection. In the earliest designs, the whole or almost the whole building, has evidently been raised by Byzantine workmen under Latin direction. In the later, the Byzantine element is confined chiefly to pieces of detail; and it is very curious to see in the capitals of clustered columns the intermixture of forms unmistakably Latin and Byzantine. Thus the capital at the angle of the choir and transept in the Church of the Sepulchre is, over one shaft, an imitation of Corinthian; over the other, a Romanesque composition of beaded lace-work intertwined round three or four male human heads. Of two other neighbouring columns, the one capital is, similarly, pseudo-Corinthian; the other bears a crowned figure seated between two acanthus leaves under an arcading flanked by two small turrets. But where the subjects were alien to the traditions of Eastern art, it is at least evident that no Byzantine had any share in their execu-

* In the later English developments of Gothic, the Continuous or Perpendicular style effected the change which M. de Vogüé attributes to the necessity of employing flat terraces in Palestine. But the consequent diminution of triforia and exaggeration of clerestories is generally held to be one of the strongest signs of a degraded form of art.

tion, even if these pieces were not actually brought, ready worked, from Europe, as M. de Vogüé considers them to have been. Thus over the clustered shafts which divide the great southern portal, the capitals exhibit some exquisitely wrought Byzantine foliations, while in the sculptured transoms placed upon them, the carvings are as certainly Romanesque. That to the left exhibits the raising of Lazarus, the Last Supper, and some other incidents of the Gospel narrative. That on the right hand, of a totally different character, consists of a curiously interlaced pattern, with fruits, leaves, and flowers, amongst which are intertwined human forms with those of birds and fantastic animals in various attitudes. The human figures are nude, and worked with so much care and truthfulness as to leave no doubt that they are wrought from the actual model. Such allegorical devices are common in the Romanesque churches of the twelfth century, and may, as M. de Vogüé remarks, be at once distinguished from anything Byzantine,—whether we admit or reject his inference that the absence of sculpture in Byzantine work was the immediate result of Greek Christianity. 'By a natural 'reaction against Pagan statuary, of which it had produced the 'most splendid works, Greece, on embracing Christianity, 'banished from its churches all sculptured representations of 'the Deity and the saints. The result of this exclusion was the 'almost total abandonment of sculpture to the benefit of paint-'ing. Even ornamental carving received a fatal blow; its decay 'is the more perceptible the farther that it is removed from its 'broken and forgotten traditions.' (P. 186.)

But this hypothesis is strangely at variance with the history of Iconoclasm. If it be correct, pictures alone would have excited the wrath of the Isaurian emperors. Yet the edicts of Leo, issued four centuries after the public profession of Christianity, declare war not more against pictures than against statues, nor were the latter less an object of fanatical attachment than the former. As the final issue of the struggle was the defeat of Iconoclasm, the rejection of sculpture supervened at a later period. The causes of that abandonment it might not be easy and it is not necessary to determine; but whether it were that the principles of Iconoclasm worked more successfully when confined to a process of silent leavening, there is no doubt that before the time of the Crusades Byzantine art had received that hard and stereotyped form of strict conventionality which was fatal to the hope of any genuine developments.*

* It would follow therefore from this (even if we had not abundant proofs of the fact elsewhere) that the use of the pointed arch arose merely from the convenience of construction. If in Byzantine

Thus, then, the architecture of Western Europe sojourned for a while in Palestine, little affected by Eastern influences, and imparting no impulse to Eastern art till the Latin dominion was overthrown. With the one exception, indeed, of the Holy Sepulchre, where they had to meet the necessities of the site and to adapt their design to previous buildings, a striking resemblance runs through the whole series of the Latin churches both in their plans and elevations. A nave and aisles, of equal length, opening into transepts which do not extend beyond the aisle walls, and over the intersection of which rises a cupola on pendentives,—together with three apsidal terminations corresponding to the width of the nave and its aisles respectively, complete the plan adopted, with slight modifications, in all these buildings. Commonly the central apse is thrown back a few feet; but sometimes, as in the church at Kiriath el Enab (Abou Gosh), they are all of the same depth, and as they are only internal, the plan of the building becomes a perfect parallelogram. M. de Vogüé does not profess to have drawn up a complete list of these churches, and he had no opportunity of examining many even of those which he has named. Although their general similarity renders it probable that further examination would bring to light no very important variations of plan, yet those which M. de Vogüé has seen differ so much in their relative richness, and the management of certain features, that further research may be expected to add to our knowledge in this respect. The piers are sometimes mere squared masses of stone, without bases or capitals (as in the ruined church of St. Mary Magdalene at Jerusalem) and the arches in consequence perfectly flat. In others (as in St. Anne's, Jerusalem) the piers are formed by clusters of square-edged shafts, with small capitals over those on which rest the pier arches, while the rest run up without interruption to the vaulting. This is generally quite

or Saracenic art there were any indications of developing for this form an ornamentation analogous to the Gothic, it might have been more needful to examine whether the pointed architecture of Europe was introduced by the Crusaders after their contact with Eastern forms. Not only did the Crusaders receive no such ornamentation, but in their *later* buildings they made use of the *round* arch more frequently than in their earlier designs. At best then, they received from their eastern sojourn a mere *form*; and it is superfluous at this day to remark that this form had been not unfrequently employed in Romanesque buildings, when the needs of construction required it, and that, so employed, it was altogether more likely to develope its influence over the whole edifice, than if it had been a mere importation from a foreign land.

plain, except when the arch of construction is made visible, and imparts an appearance of incipient groining to the roof. The flat terraces render a triforium unnecessary, or (more strictly) allow the windows (which are mere apertures with pointed arches) to descend so close to the arcading as to be separated only by the stringcourse which generally runs round the whole building. But the cathedral churches of Sebaste and Lydda (the latter, unfortunately, a mere fragment) contain some splendid work in the capitals of their richly clustered piers; in their stringcourses, and in the cornices of the apses; and it is in these points of detail that the many buildings not yet examined may be expected to yield a rich harvest.

M. de Vogüé has proved conclusively that the influence of Eastern on Latin art in the Holy Land was confined to subordinate features and details, and is exhibited not less in the comparative weakness of the sculpture and poverty of mouldings, than by the introduction of ornamental forms, which are distinctively Byzantine or Saracenic. He has shown that the influence of the Crusades on the art of Europe was altogether indirect, and that even its indirect influence was very slight. Nor can his objection be easily met, that the development of Teutonic architecture was the result of traditions far too deeply seated, and of constructive necessities far too cogent, to permit of any great departure from them in favour of foreign forms. He has established the fact, that the use of the pointed arch in the Latin churches of Palestine is due entirely to local influences, and that this fact cannot, of itself, remove those buildings from the class of Romanesque designs. But although there may be found some buildings, which, employing pointed forms, are still essentially Romanesque, we cannot admit his conclusion that these examples prove the use of the pointed arch to be a secondary question, or join in his refusal to attribute a preponderating influence to an architectural member, 'so little inherent 'in the design, and so far unnecessary to its general form, that 'another may be substituted for it, without destroying its 'essential character.' (P. 224.) This view is closely connected with another, on which he lays still greater stress, and which, in our opinion, is still more erroneous. We will state it in his own words:—

'The pointed arch, far from being the base of the Gothic system, is merely its complement. In the hands of the mediæval architects it was a means, not a cause. Gothic architecture sprung naturally from Romanesque, by a slow change wrought in the science of building; the discovery which gave it life and strength was that of pointed arches and buttresses, which enabled them to rest the weight of the

vault on points external to the building. This system has borrowed nothing from the East, and the pointed arch is in no way essential to it. The Church of St. Eustace, at Paris, built on its principles, has not a single pointed arch. . . . It was in the Isle of France, in the royal domain, during the latter half of the twelfth century, that the change was completed. It was from thence that the art, born on the soil, was speedily carried, not only over France but over Germany, England, Spain, and Sweden, by the agency of French corporations.'* (*Les Eglises de la Terre Sainte*, p. 400.)

We might be rather disposed to accept Dean Milman's opinion, that its birthplace was on the Rhine, or in those provinces of France which then were German, bordering on the Rhine. (Latin Christianity, vol. vi. p. 406. 2nd ed.) But in truth, to answer this question, it is absolutely necessary to determine the difference between Romanesque and Gothic architecture; and for any such definition, we have searched M. de Vogüé's pages in vain. There are numerous assertions that Byzantine and Saracenic are not Romanesque, that Romanesque is not Gothic, and that Gothic is French; but there is no attempt to define Gothic essentially; and we impute the absence of any such attempt to his inference that the pointed arch is not essential to Gothic, because there are pointed styles with which Gothic is in no way connected. We will not assign M. de Vogüé's view to any overgrown national vanity, for Frank and Teutonic may with him be convertible terms; but we think that any attempt to assign a narrow local origin to Gothic architecture must result, more or less, in a misapprehension of its character.†

* M. de Vogüé refers to the employment of William of Sens at Canterbury. It would be as reasonable, from the Church of San Andrea at Vercelli, and the Cathedral of Milan, to assign an English or German origin to the spurious Gothic of Italy. The Church of St. Eustace at Paris is as manifest an imitation of the character of a different style, as are the western towers of Westminster by Sir Christopher Wren. It may be more or less successful; but M. de Vogüé admits that the effect of the round-headed clerestory windows is eminently unpleasing. His view, indeed, seems almost to imply the non-existence of any transitional styles, or even of isolated transitional buildings.

† The development of Christian architecture in Italy from the fourth to the fifteenth centuries, has recently been treated with great ability by Mr. W. Sebastian Okely, late Travelling Bachelor of the University of Cambridge. His observations on the Italian Churches are accurate and acute, and this essay well deserves the attentive perusal of all who take an interest in the structure of Christian edifices.

The Latin Church of the Holy Sepulchre is a Romanesque building, — not because the substitution of round in place of its pointed arches would leave its general character uninjured, — but because the design nowhere exhibits the principle of combination, which is the essence of Teutonic architecture. It is, indeed, in spite of its pointed forms, a more purely Romanesque structure than perhaps the majority of those which had been built in Western Europe during the previous half century. The transept front consists of two entirely unconnected stages, separated and surmounted by massive and unbroken stringcourses. The elevations of the interior exhibit the same character. The pier arches and triforia might be the arcades of two distinct buildings. The clerestory windows are mere insertions in the space left between the triforium and the apex of the vault. The existing remains exhibit no approach to tracery. A solitary quatrefoil is inserted under the eastern arch of the tower.* Such a design, it is easy to see, does not present even an approximation to Gothic architecture; but such an approximation is at once established, when, even without employing the pointed arch, the design aims at producing a whole by the relation of its component parts. We need not repeat considerations which have been already urged in a previous number of this Review.† But the conclusion which we would maintain is this,—that the development of Gothic was ensured as soon as the idea of height was substituted for that of massiveness in the designs of Romanesque buildings. That development was, therefore, no accidental or laboured discovery of the architects of any one particular spot; and the advance of one country beyond another, proves only that it felt at an earlier period the full force of that influence which was sure in due time to extend to others. It seems almost impossible to avoid seeing this on even the most superficial examination of the several types which distinguish English, French, and German Gothic respectively. In all, it was the elaboration of principles contained in their germ in the later forms of Romanesque; and the comparative priority of development would depend on the tenacity of hold which the traditions of the ancient styles re-

* The upper stages of this tower (which have unhappily fallen) contain, in Professor Willis's restoration, a series of two-light windows, with a quatrefoil under the window arch; but the lights have no cusps, and the spandrils are not pierced. M. de Vogüé's restoration gives merely an arcading with double shafts; but the drawings from which they are taken are, as Professor Willis acknowledges, too inaccurate and contradictory to admit of any certain conclusions on this point.

† No. ccxiii. Jan. 1857, p. 132, &c.

tained in any given country. These traditions were strongest in Rhenish Germany; and (as might have been expected) the architecture of that region, when once emancipated from them, made a sudden advance, comprising in one stage the interval extending from the Romanesque to the Geometrical Gothic of England. Any attempt, therefore, to mark any one spot as the birthplace of the architecture of Western Christendom is greatly to be deprecated. The same fallacy under which M. de Vogüé labours, has been exemplified in the debates and controversies which have passed in this country on the Gothic designs for the proposed War Offices. It has been repeated to satiety that Gothic is not only mediæval, but strictly sacerdotal; and the affinity of its developments in the various Teutonic countries has been insisted on as conclusive evidence of its purely hierarchical origin. It is matter of deep regret that any should have been found to give utterance to words which are contradicted by all mediæval history. Teutonic Christendom of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries left behind it a glorious heritage, not only in art, but in civil government. Nor was its architecture less the growth of the common Teutonic mind than were the foundations of that structure which has grown up into the fair fabric of English freedom. France has, indeed, repudiated this her great and rightful inheritance; but it is still something to remember that in the architecture of our forefathers we share with her, as with the German countries, the splendid gift of our common Teutonism.

We are compelled to leave unnoticed many topics wherein we should have been glad to follow M. de Vogüé's researches amongst the sacred and secular sites of the Holy Land, of Cyprus, and of Rhodes. We have also refrained from all reference to controversies connected with the possession of the Holy Places. Any lengthened discussion of these wretched quarrels would be out of place in a survey which we have sought to confine as much as possible within the limits of archæology and history; yet while we gladly acknowledge the moderate and conciliatory tone adopted by M. de Vogüé; while we lament with him the barbarous 'restorations,' and the yet more barbarous spoliations of the Greeks, we cannot forbear from saying that all these things were to have been expected. It may be sad to think of mosaics defaced, of sculptures mutilated, of choirs blocked up by huge masses of shapeless masonry. It is still more sad to think that ecclesiastical enmity has not left undisturbed the graves of the dead, and that the pilgrim can no longer read the motto or see the tomb which marked the resting place of Godfrey of Boulogne. But that the Crusades

should not have opened a breach between East and West, scarcely to be filled up even in the many centuries which have since rolled away, would indeed have been an almost incredible marvel. If to one who regards those devastating inroads as epochs of the highest heroism and sanctity combined, it may not be easy to see this, others will perceive that no happier result could follow the ferocious warfare of men who waded through a sea of blood to the Sepulchre of their Redeemer. It may be, as M. de Vogüé says, that if the Latin title be defective, still the Greeks cannot claim the holy sites as their national inheritance; but the feuds of centuries will overleap the flimsy barriers of ethnological distinctions. It might be more effectual, if, as he suggests, all exclusive possession of the churches of the Holy Sepulchre, of Calvary, and of Bethlehem could be done away. But we fear that it would need little to rekindle the fires in what would then be the common sanctuaries of Christendom; and probably their fabrics will have crumbled away long before the traditions of ancient enmity in faith and warfare have lost their sting. At the very moment at which we close these observations a fresh outbreak of religious fanaticism has inflicted all the horrors of persecution on the Christians of Northern Palestine, and the Great Powers of Europe are compelled to afford that protection to the country which the wretched government of the Porte seemed unable to ensure. The Holy Land again excites the sympathies and alarms the jealousies of the Christian Powers; and although the barbarous outrages committed by the Druses and the Mahomedans at Damascus and in the Hauran have been severely punished, the events of the past summer have left behind them traces which will not be effaced. Whatever may be the political results of these occurrences, we devoutly hope that the time is not distant when Palestine will be relieved from the decrepid despotism of the Ottoman Empire and Christian authority be established in the first abodes of Christianity.

ART. VI.—1. *The Debates on The Grand Remonstrance, November and December*, 1641. *With an Introductory Essay on English Freedom under Plantagenet and Tudor Sovereigns.* By JOHN FORSTER, LL.D. London: 1860.

2. *Arrest of the Five Members by Charles the First. A Chapter of English History rewritten.* By JOHN FORSTER. London: 1860.

3. *Historical and Biographical Essays.* By JOHN FORSTER. 2 vols. London: 1858.

4. *Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion.* By JOHN LANGTON SANFORD, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-law. London: 1858.

THE most important of the Essays on the period of the Great Civil War contained in these volumes is perhaps that of Mr. Forster's 'Debates on the Grand Remonstrance,' now republished from his 'Historical and Biographical Essays' in a separate form, with some additions and with a vigorous introductory paper on 'English Freedom under Plantagenet and 'Tudor Sovereigns,' which may be useful to those, if any there be, who still cling to the heresy of Hume and believe constitutional liberty to have been a novelty in the time of Charles I.

'If,' says Mr. Forster, 'the question were put to any thoroughly 'informed student of our Great Civil War, into what single in-'cident of the period before the actual outbreak would appear 'to have been concentrated the largest amount of party passion, 'he could hardly fail at once to single out the Grand Remon-'strance. And if he were then asked to name, out of all the 'party encounters of the time, that of which the subject-matter 'and antecedents have been most unaccountably slurred over by 'historians, he must perforce give the same answer.' 'Hallam 'is content to give some eight or nine lines to it, in which its 'contents are not fairly represented. Lingard disposes of it 'in something less than a dozen lines. Macaulay has only 'occasion incidentally to introduce it, and a simple mention of 'it is all that falls within the plan of Carlyle. Godwin passes 'over it in silence; and such few lines as Disraeli (in his Com-'mentaries) vouchsafes to it, are an entire mis-statement of its 'circumstances and falsification of its contents.' The Grand Remonstrance, however, occupies something more like its due position in the valuable, though insufferably ill-written, work of Brodie.

Clarendon, indeed, was under no mistake as to the momentous influence of 'that fatal' Remonstrance, which poisoned the 'heart of the people,' which 'was the first inlet to the inundations which overwhelmed' the monarchy, and the first 'visible ground and foundation of that rage and madness in 'the people of which they could never since be cured.'

'He was too near the time of the Remonstrance when he wrote, and he had played too eager a part in the attempt to obstruct and prevent its publication to the people, not to give it prominence in his History; but he found it easier to falsify and misrepresent the debates concerning it, of which there was no published record, than to pass altogether in silence the statements made in it, diffused, as they had been some score of years earlier, over the length and breadth of the land. Indeed it also better served the purpose he had, so to garble and misquote these; and from the fragment of a summary he gave, filling some six pages of the octavo edition of his book, Hume and the historians of the last century derived manifestly the whole of what they knew of the Grand Remonstrance.'

Mr. Forster's object is 'to restore a page of the English 'history of some importance which time has been permitted to 'efface,' and this object he thinks 'has been accomplished.' Its accomplishment has been at all events attempted in a fair way, not by the mere indulgence of a sophistical fancy, inverting actions and characters to suit a monomaniacal theory, but by the introduction of new matter combined with a close and sifting discussion of the old.

The new matter introduced by Mr. Forster is mainly derived from the manuscript journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, preserved in five bound volumes in the British Museum, and entitled 'A Journal of the Parliament began November the 3rd, Tues-'day, Anno Domini 1640.' Of this document and its author an account has already been given in this journal (July, 1846). Sir Simonds was member for Sudbury in the Long Parliament, and the greatest authority in that memorable assembly on black-letter constitutional law; an important position in a political movement governed so little by theories and so much by precedents. Rushworth alludes to him as 'a great antiquary' in the debate on the bill for abolishing episcopacy, when he 'vouched 'and asserted' the authority of an ancient MS. copy of the Bible not ascribing the offensive titles of 'Bishop of Ephesus' and 'Bishop of Crete' to Timothy and Titus. He came to Parliament with his head as full of records, as that of Siéyes, when he entered the Convention, was of theories, and on the very day when he took his seat 'spake thrice in the House, and 'at his second speech vouched a record, which not onelie gave

'great satisfaction, but ended a waighlie and perplexed dispute 'it was then controverting!' On one occasion, mentioned by Mr. Forster, his exuberance of constitutional lore got him happily out of an oratorical scrape. He had let slip, or was alleged to have let slip, the ominous expression 'loyalty of the 'citizens to the House of Commons:' but, on being taken to task by Culpeper, he was ready at once with 'Littleton's Chapter 'of Homage,' to prove that 'one subject may owe loyalty to 'another without breach of his loyalty to the King.' He seems to have been a most respectable and worthy pedant, full of his own importance, and very moderately endowed with sense — a very good parliamentary Boswell. He was a man of property and consequence in his county. In opinions he was a staunch Puritan and (thanks to Laud's flinging him into the Star Chamber for bringing up, as High Sheriff, records showing the illegality of ship money) a Roundhead, but not one of the more violent class. He sat through the great debates taking notes 'with his inkhorn slung at his side.' The manuscripts are ill-written (especially in the most important parts), much blotted, and bound up in dire confusion. To judge by a *fac-simile* prefixed to Mr. Forster's volume, the decypherer may well claim the praise due to 'tedious and painful research.'

Mr. Carlyle, for whom an abstract of D'Ewes's Journal was made when he contemplated writing a history of the Puritans, says of it in a passage quoted from his 'Miscellanies,' by Mr. Forster, 'We call these notes the most interesting of all manu-'scripts. To an English soul who would understand what was 'really memorable and godlike in the history of his country, dis-'tinguishing the same from what was at bottom unmemorable 'and devil-like; who would bear in everlasting remembrance 'the doings of our noble heroic men, and sink into everlasting 'oblivion the doings of our low ignoble quacks and sham-heroes '—what other record can be so precious?' It is plain enough how the document would have been treated by Mr. Carlyle. It would have been treated, not as an important piece of historical evidence, but as a sort of fifth Gospel or 'Acts of the 'Puritan Apostles,' and forced upon our reverent acceptance with the rhetorical bludgeon which knocks down all dissidents or even moderate admirers as 'Dryasdusts' and 'Apes by the 'Dead-Sea.' The contemplated history of the Puritans would have been a brilliant phantasmagoria, with glowing epic passages and touches of deep eloquence and humour, but full of tyrannical partiality and violent exaggeration. We cannot altogether regret, with Mr. Forster, that Mr. Carlyle did not carry out his intention, and that the subject is left for sober — which are not

necessarily unsympathizing—hands. 'English souls' may have been deprived of a great spiritual privilege, but ordinary Englishmen are more likely to be led to a rational and manly estimate of the facts.

Up to the execution of Strafford, the whole Constitutional party had remained united and gone steadily forward. But after the death of the grand conspirator, the fall of Laud, the flight of other members of the Camarilla, the suppression of the Star Chamber, of the Court of High Commission, and of the Presidency of the North, the passing of the Triennial Bill, the abolition of arbitrary taxation, and the general redress of wrongs and grievances, a natural reaction set in, and a secession from the popular party commenced, headed by Hyde. The King, by his concessions and defeats, was winning back the loyalty and exciting the pity of a monarchical people; and men of rank and property and of moderate tempers, who had marched in the ranks of reform, recoiled from the opening gulf of revolution. The more thorough-going men, such as Pym, Hampden, St. John, Strode, and Haselrig felt the ground quake beneath their feet. To consolidate their party, strengthen their position, and rekindle popular enthusiasm, they resolved on a great appeal to the people, which took the form of the Grand Remonstrance. The design arose in their minds, and information of it was conveyed by Secretary Nicholas to the King, when they finally failed to dissuade Charles from his journey to Scotland. That ominous expedition was undertaken ostensibly for the purpose of settling matters with the Scots and paying off the two armies; but there can be little doubt that its ulterior object was to form a party among the Scotch nobility and in the army, which might be turned against the Commons. The plan in its conception was something like Strafford's skilful attempt to gain a new fulcrum in Ireland for the lever which was to subvert the foundations of liberty in England. About this time the seceders to the Court, Hyde, Falkland, and Culpeper, showed their new colours, and Secretary Nicholas was directed to assure them in the King's name of the royal gratitude and favour. Hyde himself had had an interview with the King before his departure, at which Charles had used words implying a confident hope that on his return from Scotland the tables would be turned. A Committee of Members of Parliament, with Hampden at its head, had been sent with the King to Edinburgh, nominally to assist in his ostensible object, really to watch and report his deeper designs. From this committee alarming accounts were transmitted to London of Charles's intrigues and manœuvres in the North, and especially of that mysterious plot for appropri-

ating or carrying off the leading Covenanters in which the fair fame of Montrose is compromised, and the strangeness of which is not inaptly denoted by the whimsical name of 'The Incident.' Then, like a thunderclap of terror, came the Irish Rebellion, a catastrophe which arose, no doubt, from purely Irish causes, and in which Charles had no hand, but in which his popish partisans were naturally supposed to be implicated, and which he assuredly did not enough deplore. 'I hope this ill news of Ireland may 'hinder some of these follies in England' was not an expression of abhorrence calculated to strike suspicion dumb. It was determined then to move the Grand Remonstrance.

As an appeal to the people by the majority of the House of Commons against the King, and the majority of the House of Lords, the Grand Remonstrance was in fact a revolutionary measure. Mr. Forster, dwelling with justice on the masterly character of the document, says that 'Parliament had no such 'recruiting sergeant through the after years of civil war.' It was not only the recruiting sergeant of civil war, but the trumpeter, giving the signal for inevitable battle. In Mr. Forster's judgment it was justified by overpowering necessity, and its authors are entitled to our unmixed approbation and gratitude, as the preservers of their country in a most perilous hour. Mr. Hallam, on the other hand, has pronounced that the Remonstrance, 'being a recapitulation of all the grievances and mis-'government that had existed since the King's accession, which 'his acquiescence in so many measures of redress ought, accord-'ing to the common courtesy due to sovereigns, to have cancelled, 'was hardly capable of answering any other purpose than that 'of reanimating discontents almost appeased, and guarding the 'people against the confidence they were beginning to place in 'the King's sincerity.' He adds that 'if Charles were intended 'to reign at all, and to reign with any portion either of the pre-'rogatives of an English king, or the respect claimed by every 'sovereign, the Remonstrance of the Commons could but prolong 'an irritation incompatible with public tranquillity.' Certainly these censures do not imply a full knowledge of the crisis at which, or of the object with which, this memorable document was framed. Mr. Isaac Disraeli, in a passage of his Commentaries, quoted by Mr. Forster, has characterised the Grand Remonstrance at a venture as an historical memoir of all the infelicities of the reign '*with a very cautious omission,* that all those capital 'grievances had no longer an existence.' Mr. Forster may well predict that such an assertion will not be hazarded again. The Grand Remonstrance exultingly details, through upwards of thirty clauses, the capital grievances, the redress of which the

Commons had obtained. An attempt 'cautiously' to suppress the abolition of Ship Money and the Star Chamber would have been about as hopeful as an attempt to suppress the abolition of the Rotten Boroughs, in an appeal to the people six months after the Reform Bill. The leaders of the Long Parliament, though they had their imperfections, were not tricky and mendacious intriguers, but great statesmen.

The advocates of the Grand Remonstrance are however bound to show a strong case of necessity for a measure which re-opened wounds apparently closing, and precipitated a civil war. There are, indeed, some tastes to which violent and revolutionary measures, and the characters from which such measures spring, are as grateful as the pungency of cayenne to the languid palate of an East Indian, while constitutional measures and characters appear to them flat and insipid. But such a taste is a proof not of moral strength but of moral weakness; just as intellectual weakness, not strength, is indicated by a violent style. 'Irritability,' said Abernethy, 'is debility in a state of 'excitement;' and this brief sentence of that sagacious practitioner conveys a volume not only of medical but of moral truth. The claim of the statesmen of the Long Parliament to greatness rests on their having carried reform so far, under extraordinary difficulties, by constitutional means. The civil war into which, whether through their own fault or through the fault of the King, they ultimately drifted, was the ruin of their cause, since it led by an inevitable train, first to the ascendancy of the most violent party, and then to the reactionary movement of the Restoration. The result of the whole campaign may reverse that of a single battle, nor can a Revolution successfully commenced be pronounced victorious till it has passed the critical period of reaction.

Could confidence be placed either in the King's good faith or in his weakness? That is the real question. If the King could be trusted as a man of honour, or if he was incapable of further resistance, the Grand Remonstrance was unnecessary, and, being unnecessary, it was a crime.

That confidence could be placed in the King's good faith, few knowing what we now know would affirm. No doubt in a certain sense Charles was a conscientious man: he put his crown in jeopardy, to some extent, for Anglican Episcopacy, and the devotees of that persuasion are entitled, if they think fit, to rank him as a martyr to their sacred cause. But his perfidy was unfathomable, and his passion for arbitrary power, and the self-conceit which fostered that passion, were rooted in his nature, and had been very early displayed in public

affairs, as may be learnt from a very striking essay in Mr. Sanford's volume on 'The Antecedents and First Years of King 'Charles.' His double answer to the Petition of Right had revealed his character in a way not to be forgotten. He had taken nominally into his councils some of the popular leaders, Essex, Say, Holland, St. John: but there was still at his ear that fatal woman, of whose demerits Mr. Hallam has spoken with a strength which becomes judicial from his habitual calmness; and, worse perhaps even than Henrietta, those aspiring priests, the grand authors of all these calamities, whose fall had not destroyed their influence, still remained to insinuate into the Lord's Anointed the notions of divine and indefeasible right, and to justify with their casuistry that course which might serve the joint interest of the Crown and Church. That the policy of perfidious concession, to be revoked under the plea of duress, was deliberately practised, is explicitly stated by Clarendon himself. 'I have some cause to believe that the 'argument, which was unanswerable for the rejecting that bill '(the bill for taking away the votes of the Bishops) was applied 'for the confirming it; an opinion that the violence and force 'used in procuring it rendered it absolutely invalid and void, 'made the confirmation of it less considered, as not being of 'strength to make that act good which was in itself null; and 'I doubt this logic had an influence upon acts of no less mo-'ment than these.' There can be little question that had a turn of fortune given Charles the opportunity, he would have furnished a prototype to the treachery of the late King of Naples, and with the same priestly approbation. It is true that he was not without excuse. It was hard for a King, trained up in high notions of his personal power, and somewhat encouraged, it must be owned, in those notions by the ambiguous forms of the constitution, heartily to accept his position as a servant of the law. But this, while it palliates his want of faith before the tribunal of history, could not alter the practical duty of those who were charged with the trust of maintaining the imperilled liberties of the nation.

It is not so clear to us that confidence could not be placed in Charles's weakness. This was the 'security' against the retractation of previous concessions which it is fair to presume seemed sufficient to Hyde, Falkland and Culpeper, whom Mr. Forster describes a little angrily, as having changed sides 'without attempting to obtain a single security for the King's 'better faith as to any one transaction of the year during which 'they had ranked as his opponents.' Charles had not, like Louis XVI., a standing army quartered round the capital. He

had only the halberdiers of his guard, who might be reinforced by some hot-headed partisans and a few 'reformadoes' or disbanded soldiers of fortune. The attempts to create a party for him in the national army had issued in little more than an alarming amount of smoke. Since Strafford was gone, he had not among his violent adherents a single man of formidable capacity for mischief. That so incompetent and contemptible a man as Williams should have been taken for a moment into his councils proves his utter dearth of able confederates. The heart of the nation, which had turned to him in his hour of depression, would have been instantly changed again by the revival of his arbitrary pretensions; and the introduction of foreign troops, had either France or Spain been disposed to supply them, would at once have set all England in a blaze. The Scotch too, as a nation, were staunch and unsubdued. Can it be justly said that the moderate party had reason to apprehend the restoration of the Star Chamber and Ship Money, or that by severing at this point from the extreme party, they culpably exposed their country to that peril? Might they not fairly put it to themselves that all the King now wanted was those better counsels, which they were prepared to give? Might they not feel that even if the Scylla of the Queen and the reactionary Camarilla menaced Constitutional Reform on one side, the Charybdis of the Revolutionary party, the party of Vane and Cromwell, now emerging into view, equally menaced it on the other? We submit to Mr. Forster that the error was at least excusable; and it is impossible to suppose mean motives in the case of Falkland or Culpeper, though not so impossible in the case of Hyde.

It derogates little from the exalted patriotism of the Parliamentary leaders to suppose that they were in some degree influenced by fears for their personal safety. The fate of Eliot was vividly present to their minds; he is alluded to in the Grand Remonstrance as a martyr to reform, 'whose blood still 'calls for vengeance.' They had given offence more deadly and inexpiable than had ever been given by Eliot to a cruel and unforgiving nature; and the annals of the preceding reigns showed how easily a vindictive King might take the heads of the highest, provided he would only forbear to take the money of the lowest. That violence was not out of the question the attempt to arrest the Five Members speedily showed, and if no attempt of that kind had been actually planned by the Court previous to the Grand Remonstrance, the atmosphere was certainly charged with wrath, which threatened to burst on the heads of the chief opponents of the Court. Five

days after the meeting of Parliament, 'Mr. Pym,' says Mr. Forster, 'received very decisive information of the temper 'with which the King's partisans out of doors now regarded 'him.' This diabolical attempt on the great leader's life is 'now first related as it really happened.'

'He was sitting in his usual place, on the right hand beyond the members' gallery, near the bar, on the 25th of October, when, in the midst of debate on a proposition he had submitted for allowance of "powder and bullet" to the City Guard, a letter was brought to him. The Serjeant of the House had received it from a messenger at the door, to whom a gentleman on horseback in a grey coat had given it that morning on Fish Street Hill, with a gift of a shilling, and injunction to deliver it with great care and speed. As Pym opened the letter, something dropped out of it on the floor; but without giving heed to this he read to himself a few words, and then, holding up the paper, called out that it was a scandalous libel. Hereupon it was carried up to the lately-appointed Clerk's Assistant, Mr. John Rushworth, who, in his unmoved way, read aloud its abuse of the great leader of the House, and its asseveration that if he should escape the present attempt, the writer had a dagger prepared for him. At this point, however, young Mr. Rushworth would seem to have lost his coolness, for he read the next few lines in an agitated way. They explained what had dropped from the letter. It was a rag that had covered a plague wound, sent in the hope that infection might by such means be borne to him who opened it. "Whereupon," says the eye-witness, from whose report the incident is now first related as it really happened, "the said clerk's assistant having read "so far, threw down the letter into the house, and so it was spurned "away out of the door." Its threats, however, could not so be spurned away, and were not mere empty brutalities. Nicholas's report of it to the King was dated but a few days after the occurrence; yet, in the brief interval, not only had another attempt upon Pym's life been discovered, but a person mistaken for him had been stabbed in Westminster Hall. Charles made no comment on the particular subject reported upon by his correspondent. But, if so minded, his Majesty might have told him that he and his Queen had their plots also, against the foremost man of the Parliament; and that Pym's name, for purposes of their own, was become a word of familiar sound in their letters to each other.'

The Grand Remonstrance consists of 206 clauses, besides a preamble of twenty clauses not numbered. Mr. Forster's 'abstract' of it runs through fifty-eight small pages. The document itself in Rushworth, occupies only fifteen pages folio, being framed with stately and monumental terseness. So long as it recapitulates the events of the reign, and states the past tyranny of the Crown and the past services of the Commons in putting down that tyranny, it is strong and true. It indeed somewhat exaggerates the amount of conspiracy on the part of

the Court, and overlooks what we cannot overlook, the inherent difficulties of the King's position as the holder of an undefined prerogative, brought into inevitable collision with the growing love of Parliamentary government and personal freedom. It also gives a somewhat unjust and cruel prominence to the machinations of the Papists, who, however, had rendered themselves deservedly obnoxious, not only by intriguing proselytism, but by complicity in the King's fiscal enormities, and who, it must be remembered, were at this time, members of a grand conspiracy which covered all Europe, and was everywhere struggling to quench Protestantism in blood. Perhaps also the endeavour 'to introduce large bodies of mercenary troops' is laid to the King's charge more positively than the half-formed scheme for procuring French or Spanish troops in exchange for Irish will quite warrant. But in the main, the Remonstrance is a fair, as well as a masterly statement of this great case, and we learn from it how cruel, how searching, how insufferable, how incorrigible, was the tyranny which drove the men of those times to resistance,—how little analogy it bore to any political defects or grievances which are of a merely speculative kind, or which public opinion, fairly and steadily appealed to, may be trusted ultimately to redress.

It is when it comes, in the last fourteen clauses, to demand remedies, that the Remonstrance grows weak, and even somewhat dishonest. The real remedy desired under the name of 'safeguard against Papists,' 'securities for administration of 'laws,' and 'protection against evil counsellors,' was neither more nor less than the virtual deposition of the King, whose honour and prosperity the Remonstrants conventionally profess to desire. It may fairly be asked whether it would not have been better openly to rebel against the excesses of tyranny which followed the dissolution of Charles's third Parliament, and attempt at once to change the dynasty, than thus to drift into civil war while affecting to demand multiplied securities, and professing lip-loyalty to the defeated tyrant, whose character, and the character of whose consort, in the estimation of the Remonstrants, rendered all securities equally void. Charles had taken Constitutionalists into his councils. St. John was his Solicitor-General. Was he to divorce his queen? was he to change his spiritual guides? was he to change himself?

In the debates on the Grand Remonstrance, all the great leaders on both sides spoke, and it plainly appears from D'Ewes's notes, that they spoke with all the fulness that great occasion required; so far from veracious is Clarendon's statement, that the 'framers and contrivers of the declaration said

'very little, or answered any reasons that were alleged to the 'contrary; the only end of passing it, which was to incline 'the people to sedition, being a reason not to be given.' The question was put after a sitting of extraordinary length, which lasted till past midnight, on Nov. 22nd, and the motion, so pregnant with the destinies of England, was carried by the narrow majority of 159 to 148. Clarendon insinuates that his party were worn out and driven away by the lateness of the hour, and he is confirmed by Whitelocke (if the passage be genuine), who attributes to Sir Benjamin Rudyard, a most trustworthy witness, the saying that it was 'the verdict of a starved jury.' Mr. Forster, however, points out that two divisions on minor points preceded the great division that evening, with some interval interposed, and that the numbers who voted in the three divisions respectively, were 310, 308, 307 — showing pretty conclusively that members were not leaving the House. It is also justly remarked by Mr. Forster, that Clarendon's own statement that the supporters of the Remonstrance 'called still for 'the question, presuming their number, if not their reason, 'would serve to carry it,' is inconsistent with any insinuation of an intention on their part to put off the division with the tricky object of wearing out their opponents. There can be no doubt that there were at this time a large number of habitual absentees. Clarendon wishes to claim these absentees for the King's party. Mr. Forster urges that the assumption 'is hardly 'reconcilable with the strenuous exertions of the patriots to 'compel a more full attendance.' It seems to us, however, very probable, that timid waverers might, if compelled to be present, have been coerced into voting with the dominant party, while their consciences would have been on the other side. In that case, the tellers would have counted their votes for the Remonstrance, but history must count them against it. There can be no doubt that the great majority of the French Assembly were in their hearts opposed to the execution of Louis XVI., yet the Jacobins acted wisely in their generation by compelling all members to attend and vote. Mr. Wiseman, in a letter to Admiral Pennington, quoted by Mr. Forster, ('Arrest of the 'Five Members,' p. 8.) says, 'This Parliament, as you observe, 'I hope may prove more temperate; if so be all the members of 'the Houses were sure met together,' which implies that the absentees were of the 'temperate' side.

On the motion to print the Remonstrance, Mr. Palmer claimed a right for himself and others to protest, and thereby brought on, in that electric atmosphere, a storm which had well nigh broken in bloodshed. For thus protesting, he was

afterwards committed by the majority; a proceeding which is thus justified by Mr. Forster:—

'The offence committed and the person committing it were of no ordinary kind. The offence struck at the very source and foundation of the power of the House, breaking down all the barriers which old usage and custom had thrown up, to keep before the people sole and intact, no matter what their internal divisions might be, the authority and influence of the Commons. The offender in himself represented a new and powerful party, bred within the House itself, who would have entered through the breach so made, and turned that very influence and authority to the secret service of the King. Palmer's success would have divided the House against itself, into a minority claiming to be free from undue strain and pressure upon their consciences, opposed to a majority claiming predominance incompatible with the exercise of individual rights, and coercing free deliberation. Once admit such division, all the votes of the past year would lose their claim to continued respect, and the Sovereign would again be uncontrolled.'

We submit that this reasoning introduces considerations which are irrelevant, and which, if entertained, would convert the power of majorities into a tyranny. If Palmer had a right to protest, that right was not to be denied, much less was he to be punished for asserting it, because his protest might damage the effect of the Remonstrance on public opinion. That he had a right to protest under the circumstances seems to us at least a tenable position. The Remonstrance was not one of those ordinary measures in regard to which the minority of a deliberative assembly are understood to be bound by the majority, and are discharged of all personal responsibility after giving a conscientious vote. It was an extraordinary, and as we have said before, a revolutionary measure, in which no one could allow himself to be involved without incurring a personal responsibility of the gravest kind. There was no strict precedent, and in the absence of a precedent, equity ought to have ruled the case in favour of conscience. In the present day, a member might clear himself by printing his speech; but in the Long Parliament this was not permitted, and Sir Edward Dering was expelled for printing his speech against the Remonstrance. The power of protesting enjoyed by the Lords even on ordinary questions, was proof that there was nothing monstrous in such a power. Surely it is irrational to say that the previous measures of reform, which had been joyfully accepted by the whole nation, would have been invalidated or discredited in public opinion by allowing it to be formally known, as it must have been known informally, that the House was divided on this occasion. The effect of the Remonstrance

itself would hardly have been diminished by this generous respect for the consciences of its opponents, provided it were true and just. A fictitious unity of opinion was simply an imposture, which no man could be bound to regard as sacred. A few days afterwards, Pym himself suggested that the majority of the Commons should join the minority of the Lords, in what would have been in effect a protest to the King against the votes of the majority of the Lords; a proposal which casts the alleged irregularity of Palmer's protest into the shade. By way of retort to Pym, Mr. Godolphin suggested that the minority of the Commons might as well go to the King with the minority, and was reprimanded and forced to make submission by the tyrannical majority for so doing. We may say with just pride, that no such terrorism as disgraced the French Convention ever disgraced the Parliament of England. It would not have been endured by English natures. Yet it is idle to deny that there was, even in the English Parliament, a certain amount of terrorism, which may be partly excused by the circumstances, but which is not to be justified. There is another instance of it in this volume, where Waller is censured and compelled to make submission for a perfectly fair parliamentary hit, reflecting on some very strong language of Mr. Pym; and here again Mr. Forster seems to be on the dominant side. Sir Ralph Hopton was treated with the same overbearing violence for saying, with perfect regularity, that by the adoption of certain words, the House would charge the King with being 'an apostate.' Sir W. Widdrington and Mr. Price, two Straffordians, were committed to the Tower for having brought in candles against the resolution of the House. Tailor, the member for Windsor, was expelled the House for comments on the execution of Strafford made by him in private conversation with the Mayor of Windsor. While we mark the sinister 'antecedents' of Charles, we must not forget that this was the assembly which had disgraced and expelled Herbert for a venial sneer at the Sabbatarians, and which had degraded, rendered infamous, pilloried, whipped, branded, fined, and imprisoned for life the Roman Catholic Floyd for using some slighting words about the Elector Palatine and his wife. 'Revolutions,' we may be told, 'cannot be made with rose-water.' Very true, and for that reason revolutions ought as seldom as possible to be made.

Mr. Forster is a very generous and honest partisan, but he is a partisan; in following the course of these debates, you detect him by his cheer. For instance, Sir Edward Dering, in his speech against the Remonstrance, touching on that clause of it

which raised the question concerning the equalisation of benefices, curiously anticipates, as Mr. Forster remarks, Sydney Smith's argument for prizes in the Church. 'Great rewards 'do beget great endeavours; and certainly, Sir, when the great 'Basin and Ewer are taken out of the lottery, you shall have 'few adventurers for small plate and spoons only. If any man 'could cut the moon out all into little stars, — although we 'might still have the same moon, or as much in small pieces, 'yet we should want both light and influence.' To this Hampden makes a retort. 'He asked the House to remember 'what authority they had for believing that the stars were more 'useful to the Church than the moon. And then he quoted 'from the Book of Revelations the passage under which the 'perfect Church, the spouse of Christ, is figured, and warned 'them that when the woman should be clothed with the sun, 'the moon would be under her feet and her head would be 'circled with stars.' Mr. Forster condemns Dering's illustration, as 'extravagant,' and says of Hampden's retort, that 'quiet 'and merely suggestive as his general tone in this speech seems 'to have been,' in this passage 'he rose to a higher strain.' With great deference both for the orator and the critic, the 'extravagance,' not to say the downright absurdity, appears to us to be on Hampden's side. So, in his justification of himself to the House when impeached by the King, Hampden introduces what we believe most readers would think a piece of rather irrelevant claptrap about the superiority of the Protestant to the Catholic religion. But Mr. Forster carries it off like a Puritan member, with an applausive hum. 'Very solemn and 'memorable words to have been spoken on such an occasion, 'containing in themselves and promulgating for all, not merely 'a creed that men may live by, but a belief they will cheerfully 'die for.' This a little reminds us of the devout exclamations with which Mr. Carlyle is accustomed to avert irreverent criticism from the weaker and more confused passages in the speeches and letters of Oliver Cromwell.

Clarendon expressly tells us, that the Grand Remonstrance was mainly the work of Pym. As a stroke of daring and energetic policy, it bears a close resemblance to his sudden motion, made with closed doors, for the impeachment of Strafford, and to the impeachment of the Queen, by which he burnt the ships of the Parliamentarians behind them when they were beginning to fall back after the early miscarriages of the war. Its general form and language bear a close resemblance to his speeches, especially to his speech in moving for a committee of grievances at the opening of the Long Parliament. The pre-

dominance of his spirit is visible, as Mr. Forster remarks, in the clauses respecting Church discipline, a subject on which his statesmanlike and Erastianising temper sided with the Episcopalian against the Independent. 'And we do here declare 'that it is far from our purpose or desire to let loose the golden 'reins of discipline and government in the Church, leaving 'private persons or particular congregations to take up what 'form of divine service they please; for we hold it requisite 'that there should be, throughout the whole realm, a confor-'mity to that order which the laws enjoin according to the 'word of God.' In accepting a declaration containing these words, the thorough-going Independents in the House, such as Cromwell and Vane, must have acted instinctively on the rule of policy for small minorities, afterwards formally adopted by the Jacobins, that of always casting in their lot with the more advanced side, however much less advanced it might be than themselves.

'King Pym,' as royalist lampoons styled him, certainly deserved better than Sir Robert Peel the title of 'the greatest 'Member of Parliament' that ever lived. In Clarendon's 'Van-'dyck gallery of portraits,' as Mr. Forster happily calls it, he is painted as a wicked but consummately able man, though owing his ability rather to industrious self-culture than to nature. Clarendon, no vulgar libeller, could never resist the spell of intellectual greatness. In the pages of Mr. Forster and Mr. Sanford the wickedness of Pym is changed to flawless patriotism. Mr. Sanford goes so far as to claim our admiration for his 'subor-'dination of his strong private sympathies' towards Strafford, 'to the interests of a public too little grateful for the self-'sacrifice which he thus made.' 'You leave us,' said Pym to Strafford when, as Wentworth, he quitted the patriot party, 'but I will never leave you while your head is on your 'shoulders.' Little 'private sympathy' was sacrificed in making good that threat. We have no doubt that the more favourable portrait of Pym is the nearer by far to the truth. We have no doubt that England owes the greatest gratitude to his memory for the preservation of her liberties from so mighty an enemy as Strafford. We appreciate the extraordinary combination of talents in a statesman whose speeches show that he might almost have rivalled Hooker, as an eloquent expositor of political and ecclesiastical philosophy, had not a different destiny called him to be the first man of action in a momentous time. We recognise the nobility of nature which, when Strafford had paid the penalty of his treason, hastened at once to give back to his children their forfeited estate and to restore them in their

blood. We give little credence to royalist tales of the great patriot's looseness of life, and none to the calumny (which was uttered also against Calvin) of his loathsome death. We cannot gainsay Mr. Forster's opinion, that the allusions which he quotes to an understanding between Pym and the Queen, in the correspondence between Charles and Henrietta, were a mere trick to taint the great patriot's name; we will only observe that if Pym had been disposed to open communications with any one on the side of the Court, his free and gallant nature would probably have preferred the gay Queen to the ecclesiastical priggishness of the King. Yet we cannot help feeling that the exact lineaments of this famous character elude us in the picture drawn by Mr Forster and Mr. Sanford, as well as in that drawn by Clarendon; and that could we have all, there would be found in Pym rather more of the Mirabeau than his admirers suppose, and rather less of the Cato. He resembled Mirabeau at all events in his premature and, to his country, most disastrous death, which left the Revolution masterless till it found a master in Cromwell.

Clarendon's well-known portrait of Pym's great associate is remarkably confirmed, as to one of its darker touches, by D'Ewes, who, according to Mr. Forster, attributes to Hampden a 'serpentine subtlety' which brought anything to pass that he desired, and 'did still put others to more thorough business 'that himself contrived.' Mr. Forster, too candid not to quote this, puts it by as an 'imperfect and prejudicial judgment of a 'character whose very strength of self-reliance, self-contain-'ment, and silence, invited that kind of misconstruction.' But surely the concurrence of testimony is striking, and makes it difficult to doubt that Hampden was somewhat crafty in his means, though we know him, as the self-elected champion of the people against Ship Money, to have been open, straightforward, and fearless in his ends. It is better to paint these men, as Cromwell desired to be painted, 'with all their scars.' They can afford it well.

Mr. Forster clears up, from D'Ewes, a curious difficulty as to the relations between Pym and Hampden. It appeared from an ambiguous note of Sir Ralph Verney, that Hampden had opposed the Bill of Attainder against Strafford, and it was supposed that, in so doing, he must have deserted Pym. D'Ewes makes it certain that Hampden opposed the Bill, answering Martin who spoke for it; but it also turns out that in so doing he did not desert but follow Pym. Both preferred, as a matter of tactics, to demand judgment on the impeachment, fearing apparently that the proceeding by Bill would

bring them into collision with the Lords, and both were outvoted by a majority which included Falkland; and (if his statement that he and Falkland 'had never been known to differ in 'the House' before the Bishops' Bill, is to be taken literally,) Hyde.

In connexion with the Debates on the Grand Remonstrance, Mr. Forster has given us a picture of that famous arena in which were waged the grandest oratoric contests and for the highest stake that the world ever saw.

'The old House of Commons, it may be well here to remind the reader, now that a generation has grown up who never saw the narrow, ill-lighted, dingy room, in which for three centuries some of the most important business of this world was transacted, ran exactly at right angles with Westminster Hall, having a passage into it at the south-east angle. The Hall itself, in those days, shared in all the excitements of the House; and nothing of interest went on in the one, of which visible and eager indications did not present themselves in the other.

'It was here, in the Hall, within an hour after the dissolving of the Short Parliament, that the cheerful and sanguine Mr. Hyde, with deeply despondent face, deplored gloomily that rash step to the dark and reserved Mr. Saint John, who, with laughter lighting up features rarely known to smile, rejoined briskly that all was well, and it must be worse before it would be better. It was here, upon the assembling of the Long Parliament, that Mr. Hyde had walked up and down conferring on the state of affairs with Mr. Pym, when that worthy and distinguished member told him they must now be of another temper than they had been heretofore, and must not only sweep the House clean below, but must pull down all the cobwebs which hung in the top and corners, that they might not breed dust, and so make a foul house hereafter. It was here the King himself was so soon to enter on his ill-fated errand against the Five Members, striking such a fear and terror, according to a manuscript report now before me, "into all those that kept shops in the said Hall, or near the gate "thereof, as they instantly shut up their shops." For here also such trades as those of booksellers, law-stationers, sempstresses, and the like, found customers among the variously idle, busy, or curious people, continually drawn together; and under the roof of the noble old Hall, whatever the business in progress might be within the Courts adjoining or in the Chapel beyond, might be heard the old city cry of *What d'ye lack?* addressed to lawyers walking up and down till their cases in the Bench or Exchequer come on, to clients in attendance to consult with their lawyers, to politicians anxious for news, and to members of either House escaping from committees or debates.—As those of the lower House, however, for whom Mr. Hyde sent the Serjeant and his mace, have doubtless by this time been collected, it is our business to enter St. Stephen's with them and observe the aspect it presents.

'The entire length of the room in which the members sat was something less than the breadth of Westminster Hall; and, handsome as it originally had been, with its rich architecture and decorated paintings of the thirteenth century, it had lost all trace of these under boards and whitewash immediately after the Reformation, when also a new floor above, and a new roof under, the old, still more abridged its proportions. At the western end, the entrance was between rows of benches, passing the bar, and underneath a gallery into which members mounted by a ladder on the right-hand corner, near the southern window. At the eastern end, a little in advance of a large window looking on the river, stood the Speaker's chair; and again, a little less in advance of that, towards the middle of the floor, stood the Clerk's table, at which sat Henry Elsyng, and John Rushworth his lately appointed assistant, with their faces to the mace and their backs to the Speaker. Then, on right and left of the Speaker, in benches stretching along and springing up as in an amphitheatre on either hand, were assembled the Honourable Members. There they sat, puritan and courtier, the pick and choice of the gentlemen of England; with bearded faces close-cut and stern, or here and there more gaily trimmed with peak and ruff; faces for the most part worn with anxious thoughts and fears, heavy with toil, weary with responsibility and care, often with long imprisonment; there they sat, in their steeple hats and Spanish cloaks, with swords and bands, by birth, by wealth, by talents, the first assembly of the world. And there, presiding in his great chair surmounted by the arms of England, sat Mr. Speaker; also hatted, cloaked, and sworded like the rest; but not always treated by them, nor in sooth always treating them, with the respect which has gathered to his office in later time.'

We may add a more important trait. The speeches delivered to that assembly in their philosophic cast, in their constant references to first principles, in the high interests and feelings to which they appealed, and in the amount of education, almost of erudition which they supposed, seem to have been addressed to an audience superior to the present. Pym would have lost his lead if he had spoken over the heads of his hearers; and Pym's speeches are far over the heads of the present House of Commons.

Next in importance to Mr. Forster's 'Debates on the Grand 'Remonstrance' comes his 'Arrest of the Five Members' (it should be rather *attempt* to arrest the Five Members) 'by 'Charles I.; a chapter of English history rewritten.' His materials for 'rewriting' this chapter of English history are, besides D'Ewes, letters from persons in London to Admiral Pennington, who was then commanding the fleet in the Downs, and had reason for desiring to be kept informed of the course of events.

The attempt to arrest the Five Members has been commonly regarded as an isolated and impulsive act, into which the King plunged in an access of violence, stimulated by the evil suggestions of the Queen and the Camarilla, without the privity of his constitutional advisers. Clarendon has in the most solemn terms disclaimed any complicity in the act for himself and for Falkland and Culpeper, who had then been recently sworn of the Privy Council, and were, with himself, Charles's most judicious and ostensibly his most trusted friends. 'The three 'persons before-named, without whose privity the King had 'promised that he would enter upon no counsel, were so much 'displeased and disquieted, that they were inclined never more 'to take upon them the care of anything to be transacted in the 'House, finding already that they could not avoid being looked 'upon as the authors of those counsels to which they were so 'absolute strangers, and which they so perfectly detested.' Clarendon also represents the King as having bewailed his error with all the poignant remorse of a generous mind.

Mr. Forster, on the other hand, endeavours to prove that this attempt was part of a preconcerted and extensive scheme of violence; and, further, to create a presumption, which amounts in his own mind to a conviction, that Hyde, Falkland, and Culpeper 'were indirect, if not direct, parties to the deed.' All his readers will be agreed that in attempting to establish these positions he has exhibited great research, and thrown much light on the history of this momentous crisis; but we doubt whether many will entirely follow him in his conclusions.

We do not doubt that Charles returned from Scotland inspirited by the partial success of his intrigues among the leading men there, inflamed by contact with the ardent spirit of Montrose, possessed of evidence as to the dealings of the leading English patriots with the Scotch which might have sustained a charge of treason had they not been covered by the act of oblivion, and with thoughts of reaction, perhaps of vengeance, in his mind. On his arrival in England he found the tide in both Houses turning strongly in his favour. Henrietta had been working for him in his absence, and probably gave him a sanguine account of her success. The alarm prevailing among the other party was betrayed to him by the abject entreaty of Speaker Lenthal to be released from his dangerous position. His confidence was still further increased by the good reception procured for him on his visit to the City by a Royalist Lord Mayor. His proceedings certainly assumed a bold and even menacing aspect.

'He had removed the train-bands on guard at the two Houses, and

had substituted companies officered by himself. He had put forth a most offensive order on the subject of religious worship. He had recast the offices at Court, notoriously that he might invite into his councils the leading opponents of the Great Remonstrance; or it might be with other hopes in that direction, secret as yet, or known to Pym alone. He had assailed the privileges of the Commons in a vital point, by an intemperate message of disapproval during their discussion of a bill for raising soldiers by impressment. He had rashly issued, on the very day after the citizens presented their petition against the Bishops, a proclamation commanding the severe execution of the statutes against all who should bring in question or impugn the Book of Common Prayer. And while thus harsh in pressing, on the one hand, the law against Puritan opponents of the Church, he had the inconceivable folly to respite its operation, on the other, in favour of certain Roman Catholic priests who had incurred the wrath of the Commons and fallen under sentence of the courts, and whose lives lay justly forfeit.'

Yet that he had formed no deep-laid plot for a *coup d'état* seems to be proved by his recurrence at this crisis to the 'stratagem of winning men by places,' as Clarendon calls it, in a most notable instance which Mr. Forster has been the first to make known. From a private letter written by Sir Edward Dering, member for Kent, and colleague of Sir John Culpeper, to Lady Dering, it appears that before the Chancellorship of the Exchequer was conferred on Culpeper, it was offered by the King to no less a person than Pym. 'The exact period,' says Mr. Forster, 'of the offer to Pym can only now be guessed 'at; but we may narrow it within the limits of the last half of 'December.' The attempt to arrest the Five Members was made on the 4th of January. Do not these things, when put together, prove that the attempt was the result at most of only a few days' premeditation? We must add, did not Charles, in making this overture to Pym after the presentation of the Grand Remonstrance and the offensive petition which accompanied it, imputing the Irish Rebellion to the King under the transparent pseudonym of 'wicked and malignant counsellors,' stoop as low as even the avenger of Eliot could desire?

The most sinister act of the King was the appointment of Lunsford in Balfour's place as Lieutenant of the Tower — a most unfit appointment, as D'Ewes justly remarks, 'unless 'there were some dangerous design in hand against us.' This was on the 23rd of December, and it may reasonably be supposed that by that day the design was formed in the King's mind, of impeaching the Five Members, and supporting that measure, if necessary, by force. This is probably a fairer way of putting it, than to say that force was meditated in the first

instance. Indeed, if the King had made up his mind to measures of violence, why should he have scared 'the birds,' whom he wished to take by first resorting to an impeachment?

That on the night of the 3rd of January following the impeachment of the Five Members and the excitement caused thereby, the King should have taken military measures for securing tranquillity in the City, is by no means extraordinary, nor does this proceeding necessarily connect itself with the invasion of the House of Commons on the following day. Mr. Forster a little overstates the sanguinary character of the warrant addressed to the Lord Mayor, when he describes it as giving 'express instruction, in case persons so assembling 'should refuse to retire to their houses peaceably, to fire upon 'them with loaded bullets.' The instruction given is, in case of resistance, and refusal to retire, 'by shooting with bullets, '*or otherwayes*, to suppresse those tumults, and destroy such of 'them as shall persist in their tumultuous wayes and disorders.' When a most formidable mob resists the magistrate and refuses to disperse, what alternative is left but to fire?

It seems to us that Mr. Forster underrates the gravity of these 'tumults,' and, by consequence, overrates the sinister character of the measures taken by the King to repress them. We know not on what authority, in recounting the collision between the people and the guard of Whitehall, he (p. 70.), describes the citizens and apprentices as being 'at first alto-'gether unarmed,' and again (p. 82.) says that the swords of Lunsford and his party 'had flashed in the faces of unarmed 'men.' Captain Slingsby, writing to Admiral Pennington on the 2nd of December, says, (p. 26.), 'The factious citizens begin to come again to the House *with their swords by their sides*, 'hundreds in companies; their pretence only against Episco-'pacie.' In another place (p. 77.), he says, 'The 'prentices and 'baser sort of citizens, sailors and watermen, in great numbers 'everie day at Westminster, *armed with swords, halberds, clubs*, 'which hath made the King keep a strong guard about White-'hall, of the Trayned Bands without, and of gentlemen, and 'of officers of the army within.' In a note, Mr. Forster pronounces this 'a mere careless assertion, as is proved by the 'passages immediately following it, which show that the citizens 'could not have been armed.' But the passages which follow show only that the citizens, or some of them, were put to flight by the soldiers, not that they were unarmed. Whitelocke says of the mob at the time of Strafford's trial, 'a rabble of 'about 6000 out of the City came thronging down to West-'minster, *with swords, cudgels, and staves.*' It is not likely

that the habits of the mob had grown more pacific with the progress of the revolution.

The Court may have had a worse motive than self-defence in forming the guard at Whitehall, but the motive of self-defence, under the circumstances, seems adequate. No doubt these volunteer defenders of the royal person were, as Clarendon says, 'with more formality and ceremony entertained than, 'upon a just computation of all distempers, was by many con-'ceived seasonable.' Probably there were some imprudent and offensive demonstrations of loyalty, like the famous banquet in the Orangery at Versailles. But to make very much of this, under the circumstances, would be to read history, not by its own calm light, but through the heated haze of a revolution. Neither the Trained Bands, nor the 500 gentlemen of the Inns of Court, who, Slingsby tells us, came to offer their services to the King, would have been available for the purpose of a *coup d'état.* The fact that a company of soldiers was put into Westminster Abbey, which the mob had tried to gut, also rather militates against the idea that a force was being concentrated for a grand attack on the Commons, and favours the more charitable hypothesis, that the object was to protect the person of the King and his family, and preserve the public peace. Flying rumours and panic suspicions can hardly be accepted as substantial proof, even though they might at that time be naturally thought worth the attention of the House of Commons. There was reason for alarm on both sides. The Commons had some reason to be alarmed at the gathering of soldiers in Whitehall, and the King had at least as much reason to be alarmed at the armed mob. Suspicion had been worked up to fever pitch. The Commons could not hear a plank give way, and see a little dust fly without fancying that there was another gunpowder plot, and that they were all going to be blown into the air.

When these two armed and excited factions were thus in presence of each other, history might well despair of ascertaining accurately which was the aggressor in the affrays which almost inevitably ensued. It is like attempting to ascertain which of two colliding thunderclouds produced the thunder. We cannot agree with Mr. Forster, that 'the point is an impor-'tant one to place beyond further question,' because here 'really began the Civil War.' The Civil War began, in one sense, with the final breach between the two parties; in another sense, it began with the first meeting of their forces in the field. To make it begin in these affrays would be to rest the blame of commencing it on the party which happened acci-

dentally to have the hottest-headed individual in its mob; a criterion as absurd as that ridiculed by Mr. Hallam, of the first carabine fired at Edgehill. Here again, however, we see no reason for impugning Slingsby's account, written at the time and on the spot, with no other object than that of giving accurate information to his correspondent. 'Lunsford (the 'man appointed by the King Lieutenant of the Tower) being 'on Monday last in the Hall, with about a dozen other gentle-'men, he was affronted by some of the citizens whereof the 'Hall was full; and so they draw their swords, chasing the 'citizens about the Hall, and so made their way through them 'which were in ye Pallace Yard and in Kinges Street till 'they come to Whitehall.' Mr. Forster's marginal abstract of this, 'citizens chased about the Hall by armed soldiers' is hardly fair: it burkes the 'affront' given by the citizens, and assumes that they were unarmed. Elsewhere (p. 145.), referring to this passage of Slingsby, he says that 'armed bravos and soldiers 'of fortune had unpunished drawn their swords on the people, 'and "chased" and hunted them in the public ways;' and he proceeds to insinuate that this onslaught in the streets was to have been followed up by a similar outrage on the House of Commons. But Slingsby does not say that the soldiers chased the citizens through the streets, but only that they made their own way through the streets after chasing the citizens round Westminster Hall. He proceeds, 'The Archbishop of Yorke was 'beaten by the 'prentices the same day, as he was going into 'the Parliament. The next day they assaulted the Abbey to 'pull down the organ and the altar, but it was defended by the 'Archbishop of Yorke, his servants, with some gentlemen that 'came to them: divers of the citizens hurtt but not killed: 'amongst them that were hurtt, one knight, Sir Richard Wise-'man, who is their chiefe leader. Yesterday about fifteen or six-'teen officers of the army standing at the Court Gate, took a slight 'occasion to fall upon them, and hurt about forty or fifty of 'them; they in all their skirmishes have avoided thrusting, 'because they would not kill them.' On the whole, it appears, that, as we should have expected, the first provocation was given by the citizens, and the first and hardest blows by the soldiers.

Nor can we agree with Mr. Forster in making light of the conduct of the mob to the Bishops. He is not justified in saying that 'there is *no* proof of Clarendon's statement that 'Bishop Williams's person was assaulted.' Bramston, who was an eye-witness, it is true, only says that he saw the Archbishop's 'gown torne' as he passed into the House of Lords

through the lane of menacing rabble. But Slingsby, who may easily have been informed by eye-witnesses, if he was not an eye-witness himself, says, as we have seen, that the Archbishop was 'beaten by the 'prentices,' and Hacket, who, according to Mr. Forster, was an eye-witness, says, 'Let the 'five members be as honest as they would make them, I am 'certain these were traitors that begirt the King's throne, 'where his person was, with hostility, by land and water . . . every day *making battery on all the Bishops* as they 'came to Parliament, forcing their coaches back, tearing their 'garments, menacing them if they came any more.' We have little disposition to extenuate the demerits of those ecclesiastics whose jesuitical ambition was the deepest spring of all this bitterness and the prime cause of what was justly called 'the 'Bishops' War.' But why should we doubt that they were roughly handled? Had not the Straffordians been held up to the vengeance of the exasperated people? Some Lords (enemies to Episcopacy) may have 'smiled' when Lord Hertford counselled the Bishops for the safety of their persons to remain in the House all night; but we see not the slightest reason for believing that Lord Hertford himself 'with difficulty held his 'countenance' while giving the advice. Nor can we infer that there was no danger because 'those who cared to stay long 'enough got safely home.'

Mr. Forster is inclined to represent the 'Protestation' of the Bishops which followed these tumults as 'a settled and 'planned design' of the Court to invalidate the acts of the Parliament; and he treats the danger as counterfeited to induce and to give colour to the Protestation. We remain convinced that the danger was real, and unconvinced that the 'Protes-'tation' had any deeper origin than the hot Welsh head of Archbishop Williams. Clarendon implicitly rebuts the other hypothesis when he condemns the folly of the Bishops in leaving the 'ship' in such a storm and getting into a 'cock-'boat' by themselves. This condemnation of the Bishops for their folly seems to us perfectly just; and equally just seems to us Mr. Hallam's condemnation of the Commons for their violence in impeaching the Bishops for high treason. Mr. Forster says that all the Commons had in view in that impeachment was to exclude the authors of the Protestation from ever resuming their seats in Parliament. Does he think it right to accuse people of a capital offence in order to get rid of their votes?

The offer of the Chancellorship of the Exchequer to Pym in the latter half of December seems, as we have already inti-

mated, completely to break that long train of preparation for a violent *coup d'état* which Mr. Forster's view of the case supposes. With this fact, and the appointments of Falkland and Culpeper to offices of state before us, it cannot be said that 'the whole of the occurrences of the past three weeks had 'gone altogether in the same direction' — towards such a measure as the attempt to arrest the Five Members in the House of Commons. Is it not most consonant to Charles's character, and most in harmony with the circumstances, to suppose that when the House of Commons refused to give up the impeached members, exasperation, and wounded pride, backed by the evil suggestions of his Queen and by his inflated confidence in his own strength, got the upper hand, and drove him headlong upon an act which he had vaguely contemplated but never deliberately planned? His half-leaning to Montrose's violent counsels in Scotland, while at the same time he was doing his utmost to form a party for himself among the Covenanters, shows how the counsels of policy and violence alternated in his feeble and wavering mind.

It appears to us almost certain that the King came prepared to take the Five Members, if they had been in the House, by force — a sufficiently heinous offence. It is equally clear that he meant nothing worse. He retired quietly with all his followers on finding that 'the birds were flown.' Clarendon is certainly unveracious in saying that he had only with him his guard of halberdiers. Amidst conflicting accounts, we may probably put the number of his followers at between 300 and 400. But the larger his force was, and the more completely the House of Commons was in his power, the more certain it is that no general *coup d'état*, much less a massacre, was intended. Sir Ralph Verney heard him, as he entered the House, command the armed men 'on their lives not to come 'in.' Nothing can be founded on the loose gasconade of one or two swaggerers in his train. His visit to the city in quest of the Five Members the following day was the natural sequel to his abortive attempt to seize them in the House of Commons, and it was equally unlike a prepared and deliberate blow.

The strongest evidence of premeditation on the part of the King, perhaps, is that of Madame de Motteville, who, after mentioning the successful efforts of the Queen to gain partisans for the King in his absence, says 'The King, on his arrival, 'wished to take advantage of these fair appearances, and try by 'a bold stroke, to make himself master of three or four persons 'who were the chiefs of all the factious proceedings against 'him, seeing clearly that he could not be at peace in his king-

'dom without arresting them: and resolved himself to execute 'his design in the Parliament, believing that by treating the 'rest well, all would yield to him.' That the 'fair appearances,' especially the good reception in the city, had put wild thoughts into the head of the Queen, and that she had communicated them to the uxorious King, is highly probable; but the vague statement of her friend would hardly warrant us, without other proof, in supposing that the decision had actually been taken long beforehand, and the means for carrying it into effect prepared.

As to the complicity of Hyde, Falkland, and Culpeper in the act which Hyde has so vehemently repudiated on their common behalf, we must say, with deference to Mr. Forster, 'not 'proven.' The only positive evidence he can produce, is that of Dr. Bates, one of the King's physicians, who, it appears, in his 'Elenchus Motuum,' declares that it was 'by the advice 'of some of his privy council, who were themselves members 'of the House,' that the King, finding the Commons resolute not to deliver up their members on legal charge, went himself the next morning to arrest them. But what was Dr. Bates's authority for this assertion? Is it anything more than the mere gossip of the time? As a partisan of the King, he might naturally wish to make out that Charles had been well warranted in what he did. It is true that, 'on the memorable 'night of the 3rd of January,' following the impeachment of the Five Members and preceding the attempt to arrest them, 'Falkland and Culpeper were certainly with the King;' but they were with him not as members of his council but as Members of the House of Commons, sent by that body, in company with Sir John Hotham and Sir Philip Stapleton, to carry a message to the King respecting his demand for the extradition of the Five Members. The circumstance seems to us rather to prove an *alibi* for them; for if they had been deep in the King's plot, they would that morning have been not in the House but with the King. Nothing could be more opposed than such an attempt to the principles of Falkland, and to the temperament, if not the principles, of Hyde. We cannot agree that between the legal impeachment of the Five Members, however improper in form, and the armed invasion of the House of Commons, 'the difference was not great.' To a strict parliamentarian like Hyde it would have been immense; but Hyde, as Mr. Forster is aware, has stated that Digby alone counselled the impeachment and designated its objects. That the King should have concealed such grave resolutions from the men whom he had recently taken into his ostensible confidence might seem

strange, if we did not know Charles's habits and the influence of the Queen. That these men, however innocent, should have been charged with complicity at the time, only shows that discriminating candour towards deserters from their side is not the common virtue of parties, especially in a revolution. That Clarendon should have lent the King his pen to excuse the act when done, that he should have exercised his own vanity in showing us how (if it were to be done) it might have been more cleverly done, by no means proves that he, Falkland, and Culpeper would have done, much less that they actually did it. The positive assurance that they were 'absolute strangers' to the design and 'perfectly detested' it, must be held to cover any more equivocal expressions, as well as to rebut any inferences that might be drawn from an avowal of agreement with the King as to the guilt of the accused; and Mr. Forster seems to us a little carried away by the heat of discussion, when he says, 'Let Falkland and Culpeper have all the advan-'tage derivable from having shared, at one and the same time, 'the detestation at the ill-doing of it by the King, and the 'eagerness to have had the opportunity of doing it better them-'selves.' Whitelocke states it as the general belief that the instigators of the King were 'the Papists, by the means and 'influence of the Queen.' Madame de Motteville says that the design 'was an important secret between the King and the 'Queen, and very few persons were in their confidence.' That the Queen was privy to it, that she was deeply interested in its success, that the King went from her apartment to the House, are undoubted facts. She came from the land of *coups d'état*, the only land in which those foul acts of treason have a fair name.

Mr. Forster is inclined to bear very hard on Hyde, Falkland, and Culpeper, as 'betrayers' of the good cause. We have already suggested some considerations which may excuse if not justify their conduct at this crisis. Those who attempt to arrest at the right point the rolling avalanche of a revolution undertake a task at once so beneficent and so desperate that, provided their general conduct be upright, they may well be allowed to plead the weakness of humanity for much that is injudicious or equivocal in its details. That the point at which these men attempted to arrest our revolution was not far from the right one, must be allowed, since it was the point to which the nation, after violent and calamitous oscillations, ultimately settled down in 1688. Hyde, indeed, we are not greatly concerned to defend. It is impossible not to be utterly revolted by the elaborate disingenuousness with which he conceals his

share in the earlier part of the movement, his concurrence in the impeachment of Strafford, his appearance at the bar of the House of Lords with a message denouncing alleged projects for the Earl's escape, which was evidently intended to drive on the prosecution, his failure to vote against (if he did not vote for) the Act of Attainder, his impeachment, with Falkland for his assistant, of the Lord Keeper Finch, his general co-operation with 'those terrible Reformers,' on whose violence and artifice he so sanctimoniously dilates, and his acceptance of a special vote of thanks for his exertions at their hands. Such suppression of the truth — such suggestion of that which is not true — must be held to taint his testimony on all occasions, and to expose all that is doubtful in his actions to the most unfavourable construction. Yet it is possible to be too hard even upon Hyde. The objectless character of some of his mis-statements proves that it was not always his honesty, but sometimes his memory, that was at fault. And it would surely be unreasonable to accuse him of 'treachery' for communicating and taking counsel with the King as to the proceedings of the House of Commons. The House was not a party club but a branch of the legislature, in which a conflict was avowedly going on between opposite parties, each of which had a perfect right to communicate anything it pleased to its allies without.

We cannot so easily give up Falkland, whose public conduct we should like to see reconsidered by Mr. Forster in the same generous spirit which prompts a glowing tribute to the excellence and beauty of his private character. A private character of extraordinary excellence and beauty is surely in itself a strong guarantee against public conduct deserving the ugly names of 'apostate' and 'betrayer.' It may be perfectly true that he was not a type of moderation in regard to his temperament or his oratory, though he was in regard to his principles. There may be much truth in Mr. Sanford's words, 'want of judgment 'was the defect in Falkland's character; it was not that he did 'not reflect, but that he suffered himself to be scared by 'possible evils on one side of the question, without balancing 'against them the certain evils attendant on the other.' Assuredly he was no more like Hercules than Hamlet was, and might as justly as Hamlet have cursed the spite of fortune that ever he was born to set right a world which was out of joint. Yet he did his best to set it right, at a cost of misery to his sensitive nature, from which it is evident death was a welcome release. To face about upon the revolution and stay its course with his own arm was certainly far beyond his power. He had nothing for it but to change sides when the side he set

out with had gone too far; and to change sides is always an awkward and equivocal operation. His plea for the reversal of his vote on the Bill for taking away the temporal powers of the Bishops was not an unfair one; he had in the first instance assented to the Bill as a compromise, he withdrew his assent on finding that no compromise would be accepted. That he was 'unsuited for his age' is in one sense true; but in another and a higher sense no man could be better suited for an age of violence than one who counselled and practised moderation. He did not break Solon's precept by standing aloof in the Civil War; and Solon never commanded his citizens to shut their eyes to the vices of the side they took. While Falkland lived, a perfectly disinterested and perfectly trustworthy mediator, the last hope of peace was not extinct. He failed, indeed, and there are some historical philosophers in whose eyes failure is a sufficient condemnation; but the force of his example, commended by the touching grace of his character, has extended far beyond the events in which he personally took part. Mr. Carlyle's sneer at his death 'in a clean shirt' is as shallow as it is unfeeling; and shows that the great apostle of force is, after all, incapable of appreciating that kind of force which, while man is a moral being, will be the most powerful and the most enduring of all.

We have once or twice alluded in the course of this article to Mr. Sanford's 'Studies and Illustrations of the Great Re-'bellion.' We regret that we have left ourselves no space to do justice in detail to the excellent essays which this volume contains. We can only say that we have read them with great pleasure and profit, and that we recommend them as most interesting and instructive to all students of the English Revolution; a Revolution which, from its remoteness, has been far less studied than the French Revolution, though the actors in it were nobler, the principles contended for higher, and the ultimate result more glorious. Mr. Sanford is a partisan of the side to which all loyal lovers of English liberty lean: but he is essentially a fair writer, and as well informed and able as he is fair. We do not know where we could find better drawn than in his biographical sketches the portraits of men who played as great parts as ever men played, and of most of whom, with all their errors, the country that produced them has good reason to be proud.

ART. VII.—1. *The History, Ancient and Modern, of the Sheriffdoms of Fife and Kinross, with a Description of both, and of the Firths of Forth and Tay, and of the Islands in them, &c.* By Sir ROBERT SIBBALD, M.D. A new edition, with notes and illustrations. 1 vol. 8vo. Cupar, Fife: 1803.

2. *History of the County of Fife, from the earliest period to the present time.* By JOHN M. LEIGHTON, Esq. With engravings, &c. 3 vols. 4to. Glasgow: 1840.

3. *History and Antiquities of Roxburghshire, and adjacent Districts; from the most remote period to the present time.* By ALEXANDER JEFFREY. 3 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh: 1859.

4. *History of the County of Ayr, with a Genealogical Account of the Families of Ayrshire.* By JAMES PATERSON. 2 vols. 8vo. Ayr, 1850; and Edinburgh, 1852.

5. *History of Dumbartonshire, civil, ecclesiastical, and territorial, with Genealogical Notices of the principal Families in the county.* By JOSEPH IRVING. 2nd edit. 1 vol. 4to. Dumbarton: 1860.

6. *Buchan.* By the Rev. JOHN B. PRATT, M.A. 2nd edit. 1 vol. 8vo. Aberdeen: 1859.

OLD Sir Robert Sibbald is the patriarch of Scottish county historians. In his character, so far as we know it, and in many of the circumstances of his life, he reminds us of Dr. Daniel Dove; and perhaps he resembles him not least in this, that of those who now read his name many will probably be disposed to ask of him, as was asked of the now famous 'Doctor;' 'Who's he?' But this question, as the Doctor's biographer impresses upon us, is a proof, not of the obscurity of him regarding whom it is asked, but of the vanity of all human fame. 'The King of Prussia! and who's he?' asked an old woman of the West of England, when the news of the death of the great Frederic reached her. 'How few,' says Bishop Jeremy Taylor, 'have heard of the name of Vencatapadino 'Ragium! He imagined that there was no man in the world 'that knew him not: how many men can tell me that he was 'the king of Narsinga?'

Now Sir Robert Sibbald was a famous man in his own day, whether the reader has heard of him or not; so much so indeed that on the strength of his reputation he was appointed natural historian, geographer, and physician to King Charles II., and received his majesty's commands to write a general description

of the whole kingdom of Scotland. But not only did Sir Robert resemble Daniel in being a famous doctor:—like him he was a Doctor of Leyden, and descended moreover of an ancient line of landed men. In this latter, as in other respects, Sir Robert is a somewhat magnified edition of 'the Doctor;' and the Sibbalds of Balgonie, 'a very ancient family in Fife, several branches 'of which were long of considerable note in the county,' would probably have been anything but flattered by being likened to that line of 'Doves and Daniels' who, from time immemorial, cultivated six and twenty acres in the West Riding. But who will not see the resemblance between their quiet tastes, when he is told that having graduated at Leyden, and published an inaugural dissertation under the title 'Disputatio medica de 'Variis Tabis Speciebus' (the title of Dr. Dove's is not recorded), Dr. Sibbald returned to his native country, and fixed his residence at Edinburgh; 'though for the benefit of study, 'he often retired from the bustle of the city to a rural retreat 'in the neighbourhood, where he cultivated, with much atten-'tion, many rare native and exotic plants;' or when he finds him in his principal work taking leave of the 'courteous reader,' with a 'This is what I had to say. I crave your favourable 'opinion of the work. Farewell!'

But though manifesting much of the quaint simplicity, Sir Robert did not exhibit on all occasions the same stedfastness and sobriety of views and opinions which characterised the Doctor; and one circumstance is related of him which would infallibly have alienated the affections of the loving biographer of him of whom he might otherwise have been the prototype. When the Earl of Perth was Chancellor of Scotland, he pressed upon Sir Robert, with much urgency and great perseverance, to come over to the Roman Catholic faith. For some time he resisted all arguments and entreaties, but at length found himself convinced by the reasoning of the Chancellor. Under this sudden sense of error, and in the fulness of his newborn contrition, he rushed, with tears in his eyes, into the arms of his converter, and formally embraced the King's religion. Soon afterwards, remaining still steady in the faith, he accompanied his lordship to London, and resided with him there for one winter. The long and frequent fastings, however, and extremely rigid discipline to which he was now subjected, induced him to reconsider the points of controversy between Catholicism and Protestantism, and the result was that he discovered he had done wrong in deserting the latter, and with a heart once more filled with contrition, he returned to his original creed. It may not be without effect on those who shall consider

this circumstance as an instance of weakness in Sir Robert Sibbald's character, to learn that Dr. Johnson entertained a very different opinion of it. The great moralist considered it as an honest picture of human nature, and exclaimed, when the subject was discussed in his presence, 'How often are the primary 'motives of our greatest actions as small as Sibbald's for his re-'conversion!' As this anecdote has found a place in that strange repertory of odds and ends, Boswell's Life of Johnson, from which Mr. Chambers has taken it, it probably is, and we fear may continue to be, the only fact known to the general reader relating to the life of one who has many better claims to be remembered.

Few men, even in the seventeenth century, began at the beginning of their subject, or were their own prompters. The man on whose previous labours Sibbald built, and whom he probably set before him as a model for personal imitation, was his venerable friend, Sir Robert Gordon of Straloch, a fine Aberdeenshire country-gentleman, who lived to the age of eighty-one, and exhibited in his life the results, and bore on his countenance the indications, of that Scoto-Gallic training, then so common amongst the Scottish gentry. A beautiful portrait of him by his countryman Jameson, the pupil of Rubens and fellow-student of Vandyke, has been engraved, and will be found, somewhat smoothed and softened down, in Chambers' Biographical Dictionary. Sir Robert Gordon took a prominent part in the public life of his time, and often laboured to control the very troubled elements which surrounded him. But he possesses a still higher claim to the gratitude of his countrymen as the first scientific geographer and rational antiquarian of Scotland. It was to the first of these pursuits more particularly that he devoted himself, at the suggestion, it is said, of Sir John Scot of Scotstarvet, the Director of the Scottish Chancery, on whose mind the necessity of a correct atlas of his native country, as a preliminary step to all satisfactory progress either in the study of its past, or the improvement of its present condition, had particularly impressed itself. John Blaeu, the Dutch publisher, who was then engaged in the preparation of the famous atlas which bears his name, was naturally disposed to concur in a work of so much general as well as local importance; and it is a remarkable instance of the extent to which Scotland was at this time dependent on the continent, that but for the aid thus afforded from without, there is reason to believe that so obviously necessary a work would have had to await the efforts of another generation. But though the work of the engraver and the publisher was done in Holland,

we are indebted, if we may believe Blaeu's own address to the reader, for the more important preliminary labours to Scotchmen; and the whole merit both of suggestion and superintendence he ascribes to Scot. 'Opus hoc, si Nobilissimo ac Magnifico 'viro, Joanni Scoto, Scoto-Tarvatio, imputaveris, suam prolem 'reddes suo patri.' By Scot's exertions the very beautiful geographical sketches of Timothy Pont, which are still preserved in the Advocate's Library at Edinburgh, had been recovered from his heirs, who had kept them so carelessly that they were in no small danger of being destroyed by moths and vermin. These sketches Scot transmitted to Blaeu, who, at his suggestion, made a formal application to the Scottish Government to have Sir Robert Gordon appointed to arrange and complete them, and prepare them for publication. What may be regarded as Gordon's commission to this effect has been preserved. It is in the usual form of a royal letter, and shows to how great an extent it was then thought necessary to represent the monarch as personally interested in all works of public importance.

'Having lately seen certain charts of divers shires of our ancient kingdom, sent here from Amsterdam, to be corrected and helpit in the defects thereof, and being informed of your sufficiency in that art, and of your love both of learning and the credit of your nation, we have therefore thought fit hereby earnestly to intreat you to take so much pains as to revise the said charts, and to help them in such things as you find deficient thereuntil, that they may be sent back by the direction of our Chancellor to Holland; which, as the same will be honourable for yourself, so shall it do us good and acceptable service, and if occasion present we shall not be unmindful thereof. From our palace of Holyrood House, the 8th October, 1641.'

Whilst the work was in progress Scotstarvet went to Holland to lend his personal aid; and Blaeu relates how on his arrival, after two of his acquaintances —of whom one was the famous Vossius, the author of the 'Historia Pelagiana'— had been 'visos et salutatos perhumaniter,' he applied himself to the work of compiling the description of Scotland from memory. It is a singular picture of the intellectual life of the times,— an old Scottish official, the author of 'The Staggering State of 'Scots Statesmen,' dictating in Latin, to a Dutch amanuensis in Amsterdam, a description from memory of the mountains and rivers, the houses and corn-fields, of the various counties of Scotland in the middle of the seventeenth century!

The year 1755 first saw Scotland in possession of what alone we should now be disposed to regard as a map, viz., a delineation of its surface, professedly at least the result of actual measurement; and it would have gratified Heraclitus to know

that in Scotland, as indeed almost every where else, war, in the strictest sense, was the father of geographical and topographical science. The cause which immediately prompted the undertaking in question, was the difficulty which the commander of the royal troops had felt and expressed in carrying on the campaign of 1745 without maps, against an enemy whose local knowledge rendered all maps surperfluous; and the immediate author of the survey thus undertaken was the much — and perhaps justly — reviled Duke of Cumberland.

It was no doubt in imitation of the proceedings which had been adopted to induce Straloch to undertake his chorographical labours, that some forty years afterwards his young friend and protégé Sibbald, was appointed by Charles II. to carry out the topographical, statistical, and antiquarian inquiries, which had formed part of Scotstarvet's original scheme. Nor will it detract from the merits of the late Sir John Sinclair in the eyes of those who know to how great an extent one generation always stands on the shoulders of another, and, intellectually as well as physically, 'bones and ashes feed the golden corn,' when we add that it was to his predecessors in the seventeenth century that he too was indebted, not only for the general idea of 'The Sta-'tistical Account of Scotland,' in which he so satisfactorily accomplished the more utilitarian side at least of the work which they contemplated, but also for suggesting to him the means by which he ultimately accomplished his generous and enlightened task. At Scot's suggestion the General Assembly issued, in 1649, 'a recommendation to the brethren to make out descrip-'tions of those parts of the kingdom which were not yet de-'scribed;' his object being, as Blaeu informs us, to supplement his own and Gordon's descriptions of the various counties, by the information thus to be gathered from the parochial clergy. The 'recommendation' was not attended to as Scot had expected, chiefly — we are entitled from Sir John Sinclair's ultimate success to conclude — for the reason suggested by Chalmers, that 'the clergy of that age were otherwise occupied 'than with chorographical inquiries;' but partly also, it may be, as Blaeu less charitably hints, from the aversion which most men feel to laborious undertakings to which neither premium nor penalty is attached. But from whatever causes it may have arisen, there is every reason to believe that it was the want of co-operation on the part of the clergy which prevented Scott, Gordon, and Sibbald from dividing amongst them the credit of furnishing Scotland with a history in many respects more complete than she, or perhaps any other country in Eu-

rope, yet possesses.* The only portions of this gigantic undertaking which Sibbald completed, were the history of his native county of Fife, and of the adjacent counties of Kinross, Stirling, and Linlithgow; a description of Orkney and Shetland; and an account of the writers, ancient and modern, who have treated of Scotland, printed and manuscript; the latter work being a mere collection of materials, 'done,' as he mentions on the title-page, 'for the use of such as may apply themselves to describe the whole country or any part of it.'

It would be altogether out of place here to criticise a work so well known to the naturalist, the antiquary, and the statistician, as a link in the history of their respective sciences, and of so little value to the popular searcher after results, as the scientific portion of Sibbald's 'History of Fife.' Its author was sufficiently eminent as a naturalist to have a plant called after him by Linnæus (Sibbaldia); and as an antiquary he had 'the honour of leading the way in tracing the descent of the 'present Scots from the Gothic tribes of the north of Germany;' but in both departments we shall assign their present position to his works with sufficient accuracy if we say that they have

* In addition to the 'recommendation' above mentioned, or more probably in consequence of its having failed to call forth the desired information, Sibbald, in his capacity of Geographer Royal, published, in 1682, 'one advertisement in our language and some general queries, 'copies whereof were sent over all the kingdome.' It was in answer to these inquiries that the 'Large Description of Galloway, addressed 'to Sir Robert Sibbald,' was drawn up by Mr. Andrew Sympson, a curate of the Scottish Episcopal Church, who, as he himself informs us, had been 'a residenter in one of the parishes of the presbytery of 'Wigton for more than twentie years, *per varios casus et per dis-* '*crimina rerum.*' The parish was Kirkinner, of which Sympson was incumbent when Episcopacy was in the ascendant, up to the period of the Revolution. He was a poet too, author of the 'Tri-'patriarchon, or, Lives of the Three Patriarchs;' and of a 'Con-'cordance of the New Testament,' an edition of Sir George Mackenzie's 'Laws and Customs of Scotland,' &c. After his final rejection from his cure he became a printer, and in many ways was an active and meritorious man in his day. The 'large description,'—which in the eyes of a modern book-maker would seem a very small description indeed,—remained in MS., as Sibbald had left it, in the Advocate's Library till 1841, when it was printed in the Appendix to a History of Galloway, which was published at Kirkcudbright in that year. As Sympson was a man of acknowledged learning and intelligence, his work has been often quoted and referred to, and he thus holds to the subsequent topographers of the kingdom of Galloway, pretty much the same position that Sir Robert Sibbald does to those of the kingdom of Fife.

long since become subjects for history, rather than history itself. But to those who are acquainted with the districts of which he wrote, to whom the towns which have shrunk into villages and the villages which have grown into towns are familiar, and still more to those who are allied to the 'good houses,' so many of which have passed away, his itinerary of 'the kingdom' is still a work of living interest.

With the exception of the notes to the last edition of Sibbald's work, which, though they contain valuable matter, are very far from being a satisfactory statement of what is now known about Fife, either 'as it was of old,' or as it is now, the only book professing to be a history of that county is Mr. Leighton's. It is profusely illustrated with engravings, which even twenty years ago could scarcely have been good ones, but it is without index, without table of contents, and without learning.

As regards this and all other subjects of historical and antiquarian interest, the only authentic sources of information where, as in Fife, there is no creditable county history of recent date, are the registers of the various religious houses, and other works of a similar nature, recently printed by the antiquarian and literary clubs of Scotland.* Much learning and industry, which generally has had no other reward than that feeling of personal satisfaction which the discovery and promulgation of truth always affords, have been expended by editors of the works issued by these societies; and there is scarcely a subject connected with the former condition of the land and its inhabitants, from the relations which subsisted between the King and his vassals, and the titles by which the great religious houses hold their possessions, to the modes in which lovers exchanged their vows, and housewives paid their tradesmen's bills, on which new light has not been thrown within the last twenty years. But the form in which these works are issued is by no means such as to supersede the labours of the historian, either general or local; and it has often been a subject of regret

* Of these very valuable institutions the most important are,—the Bannatyne, which takes its name from him to whose self-imposed labours during the necessary seclusion caused by the plague in 1568, we are indebted for the preservation of nearly all the productions of the Scottish poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; the Maitland, so called from the blind knight of Lothington; the Roxburghe, the earliest of all the printing clubs, which was instituted in 1812 in commemoration of the sale of the famous library of the Duke of Roxburghe; the Spalding, the Abbotsford, &c.

to us, that, *for the present,* so much information of general interest is, somewhat needlessly as it seems to us, confined to the narrow circle of the members of the respective clubs. The expensive form in which the works are issued, even in the rare instances in which additional copies are allowed to be printed off for subscribers, places them totally beyond the reach of any but the wealthiest class of readers. There is something slightly pedantic, too, in the determination with which, not the antique modes of spelling alone, but forgotten contractions, and exploded modes of forming the letters are adhered to, and the utter absence of all note or comment, with the exception perhaps of a slight preface.

In some cases, indeed, this preface contains to a considerable extent such an introduction as we desiderate. Of this the Register of the Priory of the Cathedral Church of St. Andrews, printed by the Bannatyne Club, under the very able editorship of the late Mr. Thomas Thomson, is a good example. The force of our objection, moreover, will diminish as, one by one, the counties of Scotland find their local historians. Guided, in the first instance, by the publications of the clubs, of which many of them probably will be members, and afterwards by their individual observations and researches, these unambitious, but by no means unimportant, contributors to the general history and national spirit of Scotland will, we can already foresee, at no distant date compile works which will go far to satisfy both the judicious few and the curious many.*

Several county histories which fulfil the requirements, and more or less perfectly may serve the purposes which we have indicated, have recently appeared; and as a necessary consequence of the introduction of this higher class of antiquarian and topographical literature, many works which once enjoyed local and even general repute, — such as Nimmo's Stirling, Shaw's Moray, and even Crawfurd's Renfrewshire, — now rarely quit the book-shelf, except to travel to the book-stall. Of the new histories, the best that we have met with are Mr. Jeffrey's Roxburghshire, and Mr. Irving's Dum-

* The publication of the register above mentioned, and of that of the 'Holy Trinity of St. Margaret the Queen at Dunfermline,' have furnished the bases of the two best *town* histories in Scotland; that of St. Andrews by Mr. Lyon, and that of Dunfermline by Mr. Chalmers. We learn with pleasure that Mr. Joseph Irving, of Dumbarton, author of the 'History of Dumbartonshire,' to which we are about to allude, is engaged on a Digest of the Records of the Counties and Royal Burghs of Scotland, which will greatly extend our knowledge of the local history of this part of the island.

bartonshire. Mr. Jeffrey's work has reached the third volume, and he promises a fourth. He has done, as it seems to us, very ample justice, both to the history of the past and the description of the present condition of the very interesting district to the illustration of which a large portion of his life has been devoted. Permanently resident in the county, he has become known to the historical families of his neighbourhood as a diligent student of it and of them, and as a natural consequence he has had access to, and has very fully availed himself of, the best sources of information, printed, written, and oral. How rich these are in a county which contains Kelso, Jedburgh, Melrose, Dryburgh, Abbotsford, Yetholm; which is watered by the Tweed, the Teviot, the Jed, and the Gala; which was the centre of free-booting and minstrelsy in the past, and is that of every form of Scottish wellbeing, intelligence, and enterprise at present, need not be told. But if the subject be rich, the treatment of it, one would have thought, had been already ample; and it is surprising to find, after all that had been written about the Scottish Border, that so much that is interesting remained to be gleaned by the unpretending labours of a local antiquary and topographer.

The wild and lawless state of this portion of Scotland in early times, was often contrasted with the quiet and orderly condition of Fife. 'Thift' and 'Oppression,' two of the *dramatis personæ* in one of Sir David Lindsay's pieces, are both represented as Borderers; and the latter personage, who seems to have come in contact with the legal institutions of 'the 'kingdom,' exclaims: —

> 'War God that I were sound and hail,
> Now lyftit into Liddesdail;
> The Mers sowld fynd me brif and caill,
> What rack of breid?
> War I thair lyftit with my lyfe,
> The devill sowld styk me with a knyffe,
> An' ever I cum agane in Fyfe,
> Till I were deid.'*

In like manner Pitscottie, speaking of the good effects which had been produced by an expedition which James V. had undertaken for the purpose of quelling the banditti of the borders, says, 'Thereafter there was great peace and rest a long time, 'wherethrough the king had great profit; for he had ten 'thousand sheep going in the Etrick forest, in keeping of An-

* 'Minstrelsy of the Border,' introd.

'drew Bell, who made the king so good count of them as they 'had gone in the bounds of Fife.'*

The local position of the two districts, the one in the very centre of Scotland, the other lying along the frontier of a hostile kingdom, was no doubt the main cause of this diversity of social condition. But the physical aspects of the two counties are as dissimilar as their historical circumstances, and the contrast which they present is farther interesting as it seems to correspond to two distinct and almost opposite types of Scottish national character. The wave-beaten shores and wide windy corn-fields of Fife, with their tall luxuriant grain and short stunted trees; the numerous old Scoto-Gallic trading towns which fringe its southern coast; its small estates, high rents, and high farming; its comparative equality of wealth and well-being; the universality with which a species of somewhat prosaic intelligence is diffused; its early and consistent though, compared with the west of Scotland, always moderate Calvinism — all are emblems of the cautious, sober, vigorous, though somewhat hard and even arid character, which a one-sided, though not erroneous opinion, has so generally ascribed to the Scotch. On the other hand, the leafy glades and orchards of Roxburghshire; its rich haughs and green mountains; its wars and traditions, and superstitions and songs; its cavalier religion and politics; mark it as the original seat of that adventurous, romantic, and fantastic cast of character which, though less prevalent in our day, is not less Scottish than the other. In politics, Fife might be considered the more thoroughly Whig county of the two: but in this respect Roxburghshire no longer yields to her northern sister, since she is represented in either House of Parliament by the noble Duke on whom she confers a title and by the worthy Baronet of Ancrum, descended from the eldest branch of the Scotts, whilst she counts among her resident landed proprietors the Earls of Minto and the present Lord High Chancellor of England.

But Roxburghshire will be better understood when described by a native pen; and here is a bird's-eye view of the scene of his labours, which Mr. Jeffrey presents to his readers in the outset: —

'The district viewed from the summit of the Dunian is exquisitely beautiful. This hill is situated in the centre of Teviotdale, and commands an extensive prospect in every direction. To the north-east the eye wanders along the lovely vales of Teviot and Tweed, to the neighbourhood of Berwick; while on the south-west

* Ibid.

the vicinity of the Solway appears in the distance. This extensive view, east and west, is obtained by a line of low land extending from the Solway to Berwick, and in the middle of which the Dunian is placed. This valley is the tract of the old red sandstone formation, which girdles with a belt of sand almost every hill in its narrow course. On the south the prospect is confined by the border mountains, and on the north by the hills of the Lammermoor range. From the neighbourhood of Yetholm to the termination of the Lammermoor hills, the district is enclosed by a chain of mountain summits on the south, west and north. Within this circle of hills is an extensive territory, which, looked down upon from the top of the Dunian, resembles a great basin. It is rich to a proverb, in a high state of cultivation, and exhibits as lovely a picture of a smiling landscape, which nature and art have alike contributed to enrich and adorn, as the eye can often find an opportunity to rest on. The margins of the Tweed and Teviot are, throughout their courses, studded with the seats of the nobility and gentry, embosomed in woods, while here and there, in the nooks and corners of the smaller rivers and streams, elegant mansions appear surrounded by the most picturesque scenery. Occasionally the eye is arrested in its survey by the remains of forts, strongly rooted in some craggy steep, bidding defiance to the ravages of time, and telling in their ruins the history of other days, when the district was the chess-board on which were performed "scenes surpassing fable and yet true." The ruined pile in the vale below, while it adds to the beauty and interest of the picture, carries the mind back to that period when the early Christian fathers laboured for the conversion of our pagan ancestors.' (*Jeffrey's Roxburghshire*, vol. i. p. 14.)

Roxburghshire is not rich in lakes, and in his chapter on lochs and rivers, Mr. Jeffrey mentions only one which deserves notice, and that not on its own account.

'On the high ground which runs from Eildon hills westward, there is within the estate of Abbotsford a beautiful sheet of water named Cauldshiels, fully a mile in circumference, surrounded by thriving young forests planted by Sir Walter Scott. From this mountain tarn runs Huntly Burn, where tradition says Thomas the Rhymer held his meetings with the Fairy Queen. This was a favourite haunt of the minstrel; he loved to wander where—

'"——the stream, the same for ever flows,
Soft gliding through the leafy brake,
From Cauldshiels' dark unfathomed lake."'

(*Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 29.)

It is its rivers that form the great natural feature of Roxburghshire, every one of which, from the great 'bounding 'river' itself to the smallest stream which joins it, has its character and history. In Roxburghshire the Tweed is entirely Scottish; for though it runs a course of thirty miles within the county, it quits it before it becomes the border line, and acquires

that international character which has made its respective banks the emblems of two separate nationalities. The Teviot is the second of these storied streams, both in magnitude and in interest, and Mr. Jeffrey describes it with great fidelity, quoting, as well he might, the verses beginning —

> 'Sweet Teviot, on thy silver tide
> The gleaming bale-fires blaze no more;
> No longer steel-clad warriors ride
> Along thy wild and willowed shore.'

We cannot follow Mr. Jeffrey through modern Roxburghshire, though, with such names as the Leader, the Gala, the Liddel, and the Hermitage before us, the temptation to linger by its streamlets is great. But we must make room for a portion of the curious information regarding its ancient state, which his fourth chapter contains. It is interesting to know, on authority more reliable than the report even of Cæsar or Tacitus, that Roxburgh was a vast marshy forest when the Romans entered it. In its fens and morasses, Mr. Jeffrey tells us that stumps of trees are often found erect, fixed in the ground as when growing, whilst Roman coins and medals which lie beside them attest that their tall branches were lopped by Roman hands. We seem to hear the strokes of these Roman axes in the far distance, and we cannot but envy the antiquarian when he succeeds, by so simple a discovery, in bringing us face to face with the past.

In further proof of the sylvan character of the district, even subsequent to these Roman clearances, Mr. Jeffrey has made a large collection of names of places, all ending or beginning with such syllables as *wood, bush, trees, birks, oak, shaw, broom, brier,* &c.; and a similar collection reveals to us the kinds of animals which then roamed in these forests. We have *Swine*-laws, *Boar*-hope, *Wolf*-cleuch, *Deer*-hope, *Hind*-hopes, *Tod*-crags, many of them recurring several times. He has lastly referred to many grants by our early kings, in which the royal forests are referred to. A number of these forests were destroyed in the wars with England, and several also by the Scottish kings for the purpose of expelling the bands of robbers and rebels which infested them. But down even to a comparatively late period Jedburgh forest was an impenetrable stronghold, under cover of which its lord sometimes bade defiance to the armies of England, and at other times refused to obey the mandates of the kings of Fife and Lothian, as the borderers were in the habit of contemptuously denominating their lawful sovereigns. But

there were other causes besides invasion and war, which contributed to the disappearance of these forests.

'Before the introduction of coal into the district, wood was the principal as well as the earliest fuel. Even after peats and turfs began to be used in the reign of David I., wood continued to be burned in the monasteries, castles, and houses of the wealthy. A vast amount of wood was also consumed in the salt works of the country, which, so early as the twelfth century, furnished a considerable revenue to the kings and nobles, and even a source of great profit to the monks. The chartularies of the various abbeys abound in grants of salt works to the monks, and the necessary privilege of cutting wood in the forests to "*sustain the pan.*" So great was the waste of wood in the manufacture of this article alone, that the want of it began to be severely felt in the fourteenth century. In a charter dated 1284, peat and *coal* appear; but it was not till the commencement of the seventeenth century that coal became the common fuel of this part of the island. The state of the roads restricted its use to the neighbourhood of the collieries. It will therefore be seen, that independently of the destruction of the forests by the Romans, and afterwards by the English, who delighted to take their pleasure in the Scottish woods, there is no difficulty in accounting for the disappearance of the remainder of the extensive forests which at one time covered the land.' . . . 'Now only a few stately oaks, bearing evident marks of having stood the breeze of many centuries, rear their majestic heads among clumps of natural alder and birches, plainly indicating that other trees had once crowded the intermediate spaces.' (*Jeffrey's Roxburghshire*, p. 85.)

The geological chapter in the first volume is from another pen, that of the Rev. James Duncan. It is done with much care and knowledge; and should Mr. Duncan complete his share of the work by compiling the botanical and zoological chapters which are still promised to the public, the book will form a very valuable guide to the naturalist as well as to the topographer and the antiquarian.

In his chapter on the general antiquities of Roxburghshire, Mr. Jeffrey, like so many others, has expressed a confident opinion on the Pictish controversy. But he has followed Chalmers in this and in other antiquarian matters somewhat too implicitly, and seems almost entirely to have ignored Pinkerton's subsequent labours. It even seems to us that to a certain extent he has mistaken the point at issue, for he takes pains to prove, and from the names of places does prove very satisfactorily, that the first inhabitants of Roxburghshire were Celts; a position which, even when extended to the whole kingdom, Pinkerton, and all the Teutonic writers, hold in common with Chalmers and himself. But from this admitted fact he somewhat hastily

concludes that British, Caledonians, Picts, and Scots were only so many different names for this one aboriginal people. We have already shown the difficulties which oppose themselves to the adoption of this view. That it was not held by Tacitus or Bede seems as plain as their words can render it; and though ethnological studies were probably not cultivated with much care at Iona, and honest Adamnan may have been no great philologist, he accidentally furnished us with a pretty significant fact when he mentioned that his 'holy man' preached to the northern Picts with the *aid of an interpreter*, just as his successor Ædan did to the Saxons of Northumbria at Lindisfarne.

But right or wrong, Mr. Jeffrey's opinion on this point does not affect his description of the Roman occupation of Roxburghshire, or of the remains which that occupation left behind it, on both which subjects his information is very full, and we believe very accurate. And what is of more importance for his work, and indeed alone concerns it, his superficial acquaintance with the Pictish controversy does not prevent him from taking what we feel confident is the correct opinion as to the almost complete identity in blood of the two nations which contended for so many centuries on the opposite sides of the border. It is curious that this view, opposed as it is to what is probably still the popular opinion, accords perfectly well with the statements both of Celtic and Teutonic writers; for in so far as the identity of the Scotch and English borderers is concerned, it is matter of indifference whether we hold with Pinkerton that the Scandinavian inhabitants of the Scottish lowlands seized on the northern counties of England as far as the Humber, or adopt the more usual, and probably sounder conclusion, that the Germanic conquest of England extended itself to the southern counties of Scotland, and that the kingdom of Northumbria, as far as the Forth, was peopled by Saxons. In either case both Scotch and English borderers were not only Teutons, but belonged to the same branch of that vast family, mixed in both cases, of course, with such remains of Celtic blood as the Teutonic conquests and settlements left behind them. In Roxburghshire this admixture would naturally be largest in the western parts, from the influence which the neighbourhood of the kingdom of Cumbria (whatever the extent or importance of that Celtic province may have been) and of Galloway must have exerted.

As regards the lowlands of Scotland generally, and more particularly that portion of them which lies to the south of the Forth, the opinion seems to gain ground more and more that during what Chalmers and others have denominated the Scoto-

Saxon period, that is to say from the arrival of the Teutonic races in Scotland (whenever and whencesoever they may have come), till the commencement of the War of the Succession in the end of the thirteenth century, there was no essential difference from Northern England, either in the blood, the language, or the customs of the people.* Again, the attempt which was made by Edward I. to subjugate Scotland to the English crown, is gradually coming to be regarded, not as an English invasion of Scotland, but as a Norman invasion of a still unconquered portion of the Saxon territories. Both positions are important, with reference not only of the past history, but of the future prospects of the United Kingdom, and both receive valuable illustration, and we think confirmation, from the researches which Mr. Jeffrey has instituted.

In his third volume (p. 105.) Mr. Jeffrey has given some interesting details regarding the Flemish colonisation of Scotland in the reign of William the Lion: but though we believe his statements on this subject to be substantially correct, we cannot think that they bear out his previous assertion (vol. i. p. 274.) that the Flemings, perhaps, contributed more than any other immigrants to make the people of Scotland what they are at the present day.

'During the reigns of William Rufus and Henry I., the Flemings migrated in great numbers to England, and were settled in the waste lands of Northumberland and Cumberland, where their language may still be traced in the names of places. In the civil wars of Stephen, the Flemings acted as stipendiaries in his armies; but on Henry II. ascending the throne, he banished them out of England. The Flemings then repaired to Scotland, where they easily obtained settlements; and in the course of a few years they were to be found in every town and hamlet in the kingdom, carrying on trade in the country, cultivating the wastes, and raising villages on their farms; on the sea coast they settled as fishers. In the thirteenth century the trade of the country was nearly all in their hands. Berwick was

* 'Long before the Anglo-Saxon government and language had 'come to an end,' says Mr. Innes, 'the language and literature of the great and more enlightened kingdom of Northumbria were distinguished from the Saxon of southern and western England; and when the language of England passed by that strangely rapid transition from the cultivated, grammatical Anglo-Saxon, into the rude unformed English, the northern people still kept a peculiar and very distinct dialect. Down to the end of the fourteenth century this Doric dialect of English extended all over the ancient province of Northumbria, which included Lothian, and beyond even those bounds along the whole east coast and lowlands of Scotland.' (*Scotland in the Middle Ages*, p. 251.)

then governed by Adam Flandrensis, and a body of that people defended the Redhall of that place against the English in 1296, till every man perished in the flames. Under David I. a Fleming was provost of St. Andrews; and in Perth they appear as goldsmiths and saddlers. Jordan, a Fleming, got a grant from David I. of land on the Tweed, and in 1144 witnessed a charter by the king to the monks of Kelso.' 'In every district, from the Tweed and Solway to the Clyde and Moray Firth, the Flemings obtained settlements; and so powerful did they become that they obtained the right to be governed by their own laws.' (*Jeffrey's Roxburghshire*, vol. iii. p. 105.)

We cannot think that all this proves more than that at an early date many Flemings settled in Scotland for trading purposes, and if they did not actually constitute the early Scottish Hanse of which Mr. Innes speaks, they enjoyed privileges of self-government, similar to those which were granted, at a somewhat later date, to the Hanseatic merchants who congregated around their factories in London and elsewhere, and in Scotland were extended even to the gipsies, as Mr. Jeffrey himself informs us.* It is generally believed that several of the small fishing villages on the east coast of Scotland are Flemish colonies, but beyond these there seems no reason to think that they left any permanent settlements.

One of the most interesting chapters in Mr. Jeffrey's work is that with which the second volume begins. He there gives an account of the erection of the district into a sheriffdom, with a list of the sheriffs, and an account of the families to which they belonged, from the eleventh century to the present time. The early introduction of this Saxon office, and its speedy adoption throughout the lowland counties of Scotland, is one of the most unmistakable proofs of the great extent to which Teutonic influences prevailed. Neither Mr. Jeffrey's book, nor any other accessible source, contains data sufficient to enable us to fix the period at which sheriffs first appeared in Scotland, and the point is one of the many regarding the earlier history of the northern portion of the United Kingdom, which we hope may still receive elucidation from the investigations of future historians. It is ascribed by Skeene and others to the reign of Alexander I., in the beginning of the twelfth century, and by Mr. Innes to the commencement of the reign of David I., consequently subsequent to 1124; and Mr. Jeffrey has done service in proving, beyond question, that it existed somewhat earlier. The *third*

* 'James V. granted special protection to Johnie Faa, *and power to him to administer justice upon his people conform to the laws of Egypt.*' (Vol. iii. p. 244.)

on his list from Gospatrick, 'the first sheriff that can be traced 'with certainty,' is Gervase Ridal, who was a witness to the Inquisitio Davidis in 1116.

Mr. Jeffrey has also shown by many examples, that during the first 200 years at least, the office of sheriff of Roxburghshire was not hereditary, the names of the sheriffs always changing, though occasionally and not unnaturally, they seem to have been connected by family ties. During all the earlier and better time, the sheriffs seem invariably to have been simple gentlemen, and it is not till after 'the troubles' that we hear of such appointments as the Earl of Angus, or the Duke of Monmouth, who held the office in 1669. The first sheriff who was appointed on the ground of inheritance was William Kerswell.

'He was the husband of Isobel, Countess of Mar, widow of Donald, the twelfth earl, and as such received the appointment. It appears that the lady claimed the sheriffship of Roxburgh and the custody of Selkirk Forest, on the ground that these offices belonged hereditarily to the family of her late husband; for we find, in September 1334, Edward III. issuing a writ to his sheriff of Roxburgh to make inquiry into her rights, and in 1347 the same king ordered Coupland to deliver up to her husband the castle of Roxburgh and the sheriffship of the county, which he found to be part of her heritage, to be held as by her ancestors. Although the fact does not clearly appear in what way the lady's ancestor had right to the offices claimed, it is at least certain that the return of the writ referred to satisfied the English king that the claim to the government of the castle and county was made in conformity with the laws of Scotland.' (*Jeffrey's Roxburghshire*, vol. iii. p. 14.)

Even Kerswell, however, was not succeeded by his descendants, or at least by his male descendants; though the cause may have been that the English, who then, as we have seen, held the district, may have found it necessary to retain so important an office in their own hands; and accordingly for some time after we have Percys, Greys, and Umfravilles as sheriffs of Roxburgh. Ultimately the office became hereditary in the family of the Douglases of Cavers, as a branch of the great house of Douglas, who when the district was Scotch, had long held it or disposed of it at will. In 1529 James Douglas of Cavers was sheriff, and notwithstanding several breaks, and in violation of the Scottish statute (1455 c. 44.) which enacted that 'na office be given in fee and heritage in time to come,' the right of his family continued to be recognised. On the heritable jurisdictions being taken away, in 1747, Archibald Douglas claimed 10,000*l.* as compensation, and was allowed 1,666*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*

Many of the duties assigned to these officers in early times

are strangely at variance with our present non-interference doctrines. Here are the sheriff's sumptuary powers:—

'Persons dressed contrary to the law, such as those who wore clothes of gold, silver, velvet, or silk, were to be apprehended by the sheriff and sent to the king for punishment. All those who used excess in banquetings the sheriff punished. He was bound to inquire into the order in which every man's house was kept, the quantity of meat, and dishes used. The sheriff also caused innkeepers to keep by the rate fixed by the provost and bailies of the burgh for a man's dinner and supper, and also the wages of craftsmen. . . . The sheriff was also required to see that no one under a baron, or landed man worth a thousand marks of yearly rent, kept his horse at hard meat after the 15th of May, or took him in before the 15th of October, under the pain of forfeiting the horse, one half to the king and the other half to the sheriff.' (*Jeffrey's Roxburghshire*, vol. iii. p. 27.)

But the sheriff was not the only Saxon officer known in ancient Scotland. There were both crowners or coroners, and aldermen in those early days, and occasionally we hear even of a mayor; all of whom ultimately gave place to officials bearing French names: the provosts, baillies, and procurators-fiscal of the present time. The frequency with which the border counties were overrun by the English subsequent to the time of Edward I.; and the fact that the castle and town of Roxburgh were in their hands for more than a century, might render the Scottish, or rather the common Northumbrian origin of these offices questionable, were it not that we find continual mention of aldermen and coroners in the statutes of the realm, as existing all over the kingdom, from the commencement of the reign of James I. to the end of that of James VI. Nor must these coincidences in the names and functions of the officers of the law in the two countries surprise us when we know that the laws which they severally administered resembled each other so closely that it has long been a controversy amongst lawyers whether the *Regiam majestatem* of Scotland was a transcript and adaptation of Glanville's *Regiam potestatem*, or whether the English was derived from the Scottish authority. A strong argument in favour of the view that the Teutonic institutions which were thus common to both countries, had in Scotland an earlier origin than the Anglo-Saxon colonisation subsequent to the Conquest, would warrant us in assigning to them, might be derived from the fact pointed out by Mr. Innes, them 'on the whole they were not much opposed to the old 'usages of the old people.' (P. 179.) How does Mr. Innes reconcile this statement with his assertion (p. 85.) that 'it 'cannot be questioned the language of Scotland,—king, court,

'and people, Highland and Lowland, except a narrow strip of 'sea coast, in the reign of Malcolm Canmore,' (the very monarch who is supposed to have introduced these Saxon institutions) 'was Celtic or Gaelic?'

'Closely connected with the sheriff,' says Mr. Jeffrey, 'was the crowner or coroner, whose duty it was to attach and arrest the persons whose names appeared in the Porteous roll, and place them in the king's castle within the shire, and if no castle, in the hands of the sheriff. All the inhabitants within a town or village were bound to assist the crowner, and if any person accused was powerful, he was entitled to call upon the sheriff to be surety to enter the person at the justice aire (produce him for trial at the Circuit Court), or to furnish sufficient force to assist in the apprehension of the disobedient person.' . . . 'Part of the duties of this officer resembled those of the English coroner of the present day. It was his duty to bury quietly the body of a person found murdered, and to inquire into the circumstances by which the party had met his death.

'The crowner for the county of Roxburgh, or the district of the justice aire of Jedburgh, lived at the village of Lanton, and certain lands there are still called the crowner's lands. These lands, in 1627, were held by Lord Cranstoun. In 1687 they seem to have been in the possession of William Douglas of Cavers. The present possessor of the subjects is named Scott, the father of whom was commonly called the crowner. He attended the circuit court of justiciary at Jedburgh, acted as a guard at the door of the court, and watched over the safe keeping of the prisoners.' (*Jeffrey's Roxburghshire*, vol. ii. p. 31.)

To many readers by far the most interesting portions of Mr. Jeffrey's work will be those in which he treats of the ecclesiastical antiquities of the district; first as architectural memorials, in vol. i., and in the subsequent volumes as forming part of the history of the different divisions of the county to which they respectively belong. In early times Roxburghshire was under the superintendence of the Culdee bishops of Lindisfarne, and shortly after the seventh century, religious houses were established at Old Melrose and Jedburgh. These at first were probably nothing more than the humble abodes of a few missionaries, covered with thatch like the Mother Church at Iona, and more resembling missionary stations in Caffraria than the stately edifices into which they were afterwards transformed. Mr. Jeffrey has attempted to guess at the date at which Jedburgh first became a religious establishment.

'The exact period of the first foundation of this house has not been ascertained with any degree of certainty. By many it is said to have been founded by David I. in 1147, but it is clear from charters and history that a religious house existed at Jedburgh 300

years before that date. We are informed on undoubted authority' (why not state it in a foot note for the benefit of the faithless ?) 'that Bishop Ecgred, or Egfred, of Lindisfarne, was the proprietor of Jedburgh, and which he bestowed on the see of which he was bishop. The time of the gift is not stated, but as it was during his reign the period can be very nearly fixed; Egfred succeeded Heathered in 829, and died in the year 838, having presided over the see about nine years. The benefaction must therefore have been between these two periods, very likely at the commencement of his reign.' 'It is beyond doubt, however, that David refounded or restored this house, which he dedicated to the Holy Virgin, and appropriated to the canons regular of the order of St. Augustin.' (*Jeffrey's Roxburghshire*, vol. i. p. 278.)

We cannot extract Mr. Jeffrey's very full and accurate description of the beautiful Anglo-Norman abbey of Jedburgh. But here is a description of the manner in which it has been adapted to modern uses, which might apply to almost every similar structure in Scotland:—

'Part of these magnificent remains is used as the parish church, a circumstance which cannot be sufficiently regretted, because it hides from the view ranges of beautiful columns which supported the roof of the nave. No regard whatever seems to have been paid to the appearance of the ruin by the adaptation of part of it for a parish church, nor has the slightest taste been displayed in its formation. In the interior of the church as little skill has been shown. The roof, instead of being laid on the top of the original walls, goes no higher than the bottom of the upper portion of the nave; two tiers of galleries are at each end, and others connected with them are continued along the north wall, the front resting against the clustered columns, and concealing their beautiful proportions.' (*Ibid.*, vol. i. p. 280.)

We are improving a little in these matters, and the elegant and appropriate restorations which have recently been made in Glasgow Cathedral lead us to hope that such monstrous things as are here recorded, and as are to be found, as we have said, everywhere in Scotland, would not have been perpetrated in our day.

Kelso, Dryburgh, and Melrose Abbeys are described by Mr. Jeffrey with equal minuteness, and many details as to the periods of the erection of their several parts discussed with much antiquarian fidelity. Between the erection of the bishoprick of Lindisfarne in 635 and 1020, when Lothian was ceded to the Scottish king Malcolm Canmore, and for the first time became Scotch, all the churches and religious houses of Lothian and Teviotdale were attached to the see of Lindisfarne and

Durham. On the occurrence of the latter event the Bishop of St. Andrews assumed the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the district. But when that great benefactor of the Church, David I., ascended the throne, he restored the bishoprick of Glasgow and conferred it on John, his tutor, placing under its jurisdiction all the churches of Teviotdale. In 1238 the bishoprick of Glasgow was divided into two archdeaconries, of which Teviotdale was one, and on that footing it henceforth remained. But the episcopate of Glasgow did not include the whole of Roxburghshire. The Tweed was its boundary, and thus Kelso, Stetchel, Ednam, Smailholm, and Makerstoun, formed part of the deanery of the Merse and bishoprick of St. Andrews.

The manor of Kelso was the property of the king till 1128, when David granted it to the monks of the order of St. Benedict, whom he had settled in the *desert* at Selkirk fifteen years before. From that time forth Kelso was essentially an ecclesiastical town. In 1323, the burgesses of Western Kelso (for about the time of Robert I. we begin to hear of two towns) appeared in the Abbot's Court, and acknowledged that they had done wrong in making a burgess without his consent, and in a rent roll of the abbey supposed to belong to the same period, Eastern Kelso is entered by the monks as being in their own hands, and the mill is said to be rented at twenty-two pounds. Mr. Jeffrey's antiquarian sympathies lead him to take a more favourable view of these 'sexless workers' than is common with his countrymen. In speaking of the small colony of Selkirk he says:—

'When David placed the community at Selkirk, the district was overgrown with woods, nearly uninhabited, except by the beasts of the forest. But in a short time a town was built and peopled; churches were raised; the waste was converted into fruitful fields; the rose was seen to blossom where the bramble formerly grew. On the sources of the Beaumont and the Cayle numerous herds of cattle and flocks of sheep covered the sides of the mountains, and corn waved on the summits of many of the hills. Mills were erected in the granges to grind the corn belonging to the monks, as well as the produce of their neighbours' lands. The deserts of Liddesdale were colonised by them at a time when it was dangerous for a Christian to be found in that wild region. For many years a monk of Kelso lived in the waste near to Hermitage Castle, preaching to the rude men of the district. So early as the days of William the Lion the monks had converted the morasses on the upper parts of the Ale into arable lands. Wherever they had a grange they built cottages for the persons employed in labouring on the land, or tending the flocks of sheep and swine. They built bridges and made roads throughout the whole country. In the abbey the sons of the nobility were

boarded and educated. In 1260 Matilda of Moll granted her thirds in the lands of Moll to the abbot and monks of Kelso, on condition that they should board and educate her son with the best boys who were intrusted to their care.' (*Jeffrey's Roxburghshire*, vol. iii. p. 47.)

To qualify them for this last-mentioned task, one or more of the monks of Kelso was generally in England, and in the 'Book 'of Kelso' there is a form of licence to enable a monk to go to England to study.

If 'beer' be an emblem, as it certainly is an element, of good cheer, there would seem to have been no want of it under the rule of the good abbots.

'A brewhouse usually rented for about 6*s.* 8*d.* yearly, with the condition that the brewer was bound to sell the abbot a *lagen* and a half of ale—equal to about seven quarts—for a penny. A great quantity of malt was used during the twelfth century, and it is supposed that the mill at Ednam alone ground not less than 1000 quarters of malt yearly.' (*Ibid.*, vol. iii. p. 50.)

Mr. Jeffrey elsewhere tells us that in 1668 there were the prodigious number of twenty-two brewers in the small town of Jedburgh. It might be a fair subject for inquiry, how far the substitution of whiskey for beer has contributed in modern times to the demoralisation of the people of Scotland.

The cheerful and partially cultivated society of the monasteries, and other advantages, seem to have attracted not only visitors but permanent residents, who formed no ecclesiastical connexion with them.

'It was customary for many men to resign their lands into the hands of the monks on obtaining an obligation for a decent provision in the abbey, where they were sure of amusement, instruction, and pardon. In 1311 Adam de Dowan, the elder, resigned his lands in Greenrig to the abbots and monks, and they obliged themselves to support him in victuals in their monastery, and to give him yearly a robe, or one merk sterling. The abbot, in consideration of Reginald de Curroch's resigning his lands of Fincurrochs, granted to him the lands of Little Kype, with decent maintenance in victuals for him and a boy within the monastery,' &c. &c. (*Ibid.*)

In addition to their granges, farms, and other possessions in Berwickshire, the abbots of Kelso had property spread over Selkirk, Berwick, Peebles, Lanark, Dunfries, Ayr, Edinburgh,—in short, the whole south of Scotland; and the importance of their house may be gathered from the fact that they claimed precedence for it over all the other religious houses of Scotland, and that it was not till 1420 that a decision was given in favour of St. Andrews. In 1165 Abbot John obtained a mitre from the Pope, and got himself named first in the

rolls of the Scottish parliament. When the Archbishop of York claimed the supremacy of the Scottish Church, this same abbot withstood him manfully, and refused to obey his summons to meet him at Norham. The question was at last referred to the Pope, who decided in favour of Abbot John, and declared the Scottish Church independent of any other except Rome.

By far the most surprising fact mentioned in Mr. Jeffrey's history, or indeed that can be mentioned in connexion with the shire of Roxburgh, is the disappearance from the face of the earth of its county town. That a large flourishing burgh, with provost, bailies, and town council, churches and hospitals, famous for its schools, its markets, and above all for its castle,—said, in short, to have been the fourth city in Scotland both in population and general importance,—should have disappeared from the midst of us since the middle of the tenth century, seems well nigh incredible. But there is no mistake. So late as 1516 Mr. Jeffrey tells us that proclamations were made at its cross (p. 59.), and now—

'Of the town not a stone remains to mark its site; and were it not for the evidence derived from history, charters, and other documents, it might well be doubted whether on the fields in which cattle now graze, or which are carefully tilled by the husbandman, a powerful city once flourished. A small portion of the ruins of the castle remains to mark the place where in former days kings held their courts, and where the nobles of either kingdom performed deeds of valour in the battle-field, or called forth the admiration of the spectator in the tournament.' And afterwards: 'Doubts are entertained by many as to the exact site of the town.'

To account for a fact so extraordinary we expect to hear of some terrible convulsion either of nature or of society. But nothing of the kind. Roxburgh perished by what we may almost consider the ordinary course of border events, and its disappearance, more than any other circumstance that we know, brings home to us the terrible severity of that warfare which has now become so picturesque and sentimental in our eyes. The castle of Roxburgh, 'the curb and guardian of this border 'land,' was taken and burned to the ground now and again by both nations,—by the English to prevent it from serving as a stronghold to the Scotch, and by the Scotch to prevent it from serving as a stronghold to the English; and on almost every occasion the town shared its fate. So far from benefiting by its connexion with the castle, the town probably owed to it its final downfall. Previous to the English wars it was otherwise. The castle, as a frequent royal residence, must have added to the prosperity of the town, and theoretically, so to speak, may even

afterwards have seemed to protect it from possible danger. But in practice it was found that the castle attracted the very dangers which it was intended to ward off, and that the abbeys and other religious houses, though far from enjoying an immunity from plunder, were safer centres for a burgher community. The monkish village of Kelso thus probably attracted no inconsiderable portion of the peaceably disposed inhabitants of Roxburgh on the occasion of each new disaster, till at last, when the castle was demolished in virtue of a treaty between France and England in 1550, the community had already almost ceased to exist.

In the district of Kelso alone Mr. Jeffrey has found abundant materials for his third volume. Our limits will not permit us to follow him in his interesting survey, nor is it needful that we should. If the reader would enjoy this portion of the work it must not be by the fireside, or at least by any other fireside than a Roxburgh one. But let him rather deposit it in his knapsack, or his fishing-basket, next long vacation, and use it for once as a substitute for a certain 'red book' with which he is probably sufficiently familiar. Whether his skill in the gentle art be great or small, we promise him sport which old Isaac Walton would not have scorned. By way of foretaste he shall have but one extract more. It is the latest news from the gipsy colony of Yetholm.

'The present strength of the various tribes in Kirk-Yetholm is about eighty, consisting of Blythes, Ruthvens, Taits, and Douglases. The strong tribe of the Faas, from whom the king was selected, is now extinct. At the death of Will Faa, several years ago, the throne was seized by Charles Blythe, husband of Etty Faa, sister of the king. Before the death of the late king, the revenue of the tribes had decreased to such an extent that his majesty was forced to lay aside the diadem and become, for a time, the protector of game on several farms belonging to the Marquis of Tweeddale. 'He was an excellent fisher, well acquainted with every pool and stream in the Beaumont, Cayle, and Colledge waters. By game preserving and fishing he contrived to scrape together as much as supported life, and he was well supplied with drink by visitors from every part of the country, anxious to see those people who had been rendered so interesting by the pen of the mighty magician. But times are changed; visitors are few to the present king, and but for the generosity of a noble lord who occasionally resides in the neighbourhood, his majesty would often be without supplies. The king is about eighty-five years old, possesses a fair share of health, but complains that living in houses subjects him to colds, which he never had while he dwelt in tents.

'The chief employment of the gipsies was travelling in the summer season in promiscuous bands. They generally left their settlement

at Kirk-Yetholm in the end of March, and did not return till driven back by the storms of winter. Most of the men assisted in the operations of the harvest, and in the winter carted coals to Jedburgh. When out on the route, they lay beneath their carts or upon straw under wicker-frames, with a cover which resisted the weather. During their progress through the country they laid the farm yards, corn, and potato fields under contribution to a great extent. They had a perfect knack of thieving, and carried off everything that came in their way — corn, hay, hewn stones, wheels, and axletrees. They may be said to have lived in a complete state of ignorance, "without "God and without hope in the world," till the Rev. John Baird was inducted into the pastoral charge of the parish, when, through his efforts, they were induced to attend church and school; and he obtained from the Edinburgh Bible Society a grant of bibles and testaments, which enabled him to place a copy of the Scriptures in every gipsy dwelling.

'A few of the gipsies still travel the country, dealing in earthenware, horn spoons, baskets, heather brooms, and mats; but the strictness with which they are watched by the police prevents any exercise of their thieving talents. From the improved state of the district, there are few waste places for them to pitch their camp, and the raising of a fire on the roadside is certain to be visited with fine and imprisonment. They cannot now remain in idleness, and are forced to apply themselves to some occupation to procure daily bread. A number of the men have become labourers, and, mixing with the population, acquire better habits and marry out of their tribe. The gipsy girls, too, are beginning to leave their tribe and to engage as domestic servants and bondagers, and occasionally marry farm servants. The houses are now more comfortable; instead of the stone and straw beds, stools, chairs, tables, and the ordinary country beds are to be seen in many of their dwellings. There can be little doubt that the original race is fast falling off, and that ere many years run their course the oriental blood will have ceased to flow. The days of the gipsy have passed away.' (*Jeffrey's Roxburghshire*, vol. iii. p. 255.)

In Mr. Jeffrey's volumes, and still more in the illustrations which are dispersed through his pages, we miss the luxury of paper and typography and engraving which characterises the works issued by the antiquarian clubs; and the same remark applies still more forcibly to Mr. Paterson's 'History of the 'County of Ayr,' a recent work of much merit, which we would gladly have noticed at greater length. But we have no such complaint to make against Mr. Irving's 'History of Dumbar-'tonshire,' which is not only a very interesting but a very enticing volume.

When we lay down Mr. Jeffrey's book and take up Mr. Irving's, we find ourselves transported from the Saxon kingdom of Northumbria into the Celtic kingdom of Strathclyde. In

ancient times they were no doubt very different regions; but it will probably surprise those of our readers who are strangers to Scotland, to be told that they are very different regions still, and that this difference is by no means confined to their physical characteristics. To what extent this difference between the south and east, and the west of Scotland, may be attributable to the difference in blood and historical associations of their inhabitants, we cannot tell; but there can be no doubt of the fact that the line which divides them is, as regards the sympathies of the people, a far more strongly marked one than that which divides the south from the north, or even the lowlands from the highlands. Alike to the men of Roxburgh and of Lothian, and to those of Fife, of Perth, and Aberdeen, Edinburgh is the centre of Scottish affairs, and from Edinburgh they look at once to London. Their trade is chiefly with the opposite continent of Europe. The men of the west, again, have scarcely any connexion with Edinburgh, and not a very immediate one with London. Their Scottish capital is Glasgow, and in England the great trading and manufacturing towns of Lancashire stand between them and the metropolis. Their trade is with America; we mean specially and prominently so. We could produce many curious illustrations of the fact which we have here mentioned, but as we are reviewing the works of others and not writing a work of our own, we shall content ourselves with one which even a stranger in Scotland may easily test, viz., the entirely different set of newspapers which circulate in the east and in the west of Scotland. The 'Times' of course is read everywhere, and commercial papers more in the west than in the east; but in the largest hotel in Glasgow, a very short time ago, no Edinburgh newspaper was taken in; and there is probably not an hotel in Edinburgh which takes a Glasgow one. Very few persons in either place could probably name even the reputable newspapers published in the other; and if you travel by railway between them, you find the one set of newspapers cease, and the other commence to be sold, at the stations on the respective sides of the water-shed. In the work before us Mr. Irving has traced the history of the social phases through which a considerable and important portion of this western region of Scotland has passed, from a time when it was the abode of tribes with whose wild, lawless, and idle habits its present occupants have probably as little in common as any people on the face of the earth. The book is already favourably known to the public, but this second edition is substantially a new work.

'On the completion of the first edition, and incited no doubt by the favourable manner in which it was received, the author set about making new collections relating to the county, devoting special attention to the municipal and ecclesiastical records connected with the burgh of Dumbarton, and of such details illustrative of the transmission of property and the history of the old families in the district, as had been necessarily excluded by the limited design of his first volume. In all this he was so successful, that by the time the first edition became exhausted he was in possession of a mass of gleanings which would of themselves have been an useful contribution to topographical literature.' (*History of Dumbartonshire*, preface, p. i.)

The first twelve chapters of the present volume embrace the history of the county generally, and in connexion with the county to no small extent of the country itself from the earliest period to the middle of the eighteenth century. The next bears more particularly on the burgh and parish of Dumbarton. Mr. Irving then travels over the parishes one by one, giving such details regarding each of them as seemed to him to merit the attention of a local historian. The appendix, as happens so often with historical works, is one of the most interesting portions of the volume. It contains copious extracts from the old municipal records of the Burgh of Dumbarton, and other documents tending to throw light on the events alluded to in the text. The Garland is indeed a 'new feature in such a work,' if it be not altogether a new production, which the absence of all note and comment, notwithstanding the black letter in which it is printed, leads us half to suspect.

With a view to the execution of his work, Mr. Irving has put himself in connexion with some of the most eminent members of the existing school of Scottish antiquarians; a course which we recommend all persons who write county histories to pursue; and in his preface he returns thanks to several persons, the bare mention of whose names is a guarantee for his having had at least the benefit of good advice. He possesses, moreover, not only the antiquarian knowledge and industry which are indispensable to such an undertaking, but also those literary qualifications,—the habit of arranging his thoughts methodically, and the power of expressing them simply, directly, and unambiguously,—in which many respectable antiquaries (honest old George Chalmers being witness) have been so sadly to seek.

To the student of Roman antiquities Dumbartonshire is full of interest; for to a considerable extent the chain of forts built by Agricola, and the wall afterwards completed by Lollius Urbicus, the governor of Britain under Antoninus, passes through the county. Like the forests of Roxburghshire, the wall of Antoninus has been its own historian.

'Though mentioned by Capitolinus who flourished in the third century, and Bede who flourished in the seventh, it was till the time of Camden a matter of conjecture when and by whom this great northern rampart was reared: but from coins and monumental inscriptions dug up along its course, this industrious antiquary satisfactorily proved that the wall, the ditch, and the military way, which extended conjointly from Caer-ridden on the Forth to the present village of West Kilpatrick on the Clyde, if not to Dunglass and the town of Dumbarton itself, were constructed during the reign of Antoninus Pius, and by the orders of his lieutenant Lollius Urbicus. The researches of Gordon, of Horsley, Roy, and Stuart, while they furnish corroborative evidence regarding the date of its erection, have otherwise made the wall of Antoninus one of the best known of all the Roman remains in Britain.' (*History of Dumbartonshire*, p. 7.)

But the wall, it seems, has perished in the hands of the antiquaries, and our only consolation is to think that it has not perished in vain, like the French surgeon's patient, *il est mort guéri*.

It is a remarkable testimony to the engineering skill of the Romans, that along the course of their wall, first a highway, then a canal, and at last a railway have been constructed, facts which must conjoin with the pious labours of the antiquaries in accounting for its disappearance. Mr. Irving has given several illustrations of the sculptured stones and other monuments belonging to the wall, for which he is indebted, as he tells us, to the widow of the gifted author of the 'Caledonia Romana;' a work which we heartily commend to the attention of the curious.

With Mr. Irving's chapter on the Strathclyde Kingdom we shall not trouble our readers farther than to say that he has told all that is known of a very obscure object. In the chapters which follow, in which he has treated of the authentic general history of the district, he has followed out the fortunes of the great house of Lennox, and of the Castle of Dumbarton, so fully that he has been induced to write something very like a history of the public events of the whole west of Scotland. Interspersed with this matter, much of which, though quite good and unavoidable here, might possibly be found elsewhere, we have occasional glimpses of private life and personal habits which we cannot permit to escape us. And, first of all, it is peculiarly pleasing to learn that even in the terrible fourteenth century something like the tranquillity and refinements of domestic repose gilded the evening of the great King Robert's stormy life:—

'In the parish of Cardross, and on a summit overlooking the vale of Leven, and the lower portion of the vale of Clyde, he built a commodious residence, to which he retired as often as his kingly cares

permitted. All traces of the building have long since disappeared, but tradition has kept alive a knowledge of the site, which was on what is now a wooded knoll forming part of the farm still known as Castle Hill, on the north side of the Cardross road, and about a mile from the Cross of Dumbarton. The books of the Lord Chamberlain enable the student to follow with great exactness the daily life of Bruce in his palace in Cardross. By their aid he may be seen adorning the interior of his mansion, extending his pleasure grounds, and engaging in the chase. At one time he is in company with his nephew Randolph, making experiments in ship-building, and at another he is found sailing his vessels on the Clyde or harbouring them in the Leven. As circumstances characteristic of the nobility and simplicity of his nature, it may be interesting to mention that at Cardross Bruce kept a lion and a jester, and, as his household books show, attended regularly to the wants of each. He appears also to have entertained the clergy and barons who visited him at Cardross, in a truly regal style; and though his expenditure was arranged with order and economy, his huntsmen, falconers, dog-keepers, gardeners, and ranger, shared with those of higher rank the abundant hospitality of the monarch. His largesses to the higher officers of his household, and to some others of his favourite friends, were frequent and ample; while his charity appears to have been as extensive as it was no doubt well directed; and a pleasing though not remarkable feature in his character, is presented by his gifts to poor clerks for the purpose of enabling them to carry on their studies at the schools.' (*History of Dumbartonshire*, p. 63, 64.)

The Cardross Household Book was kept in Latin, and the entries in the original are curious, both in matter and form. Here is the one regarding 'Peter the fool.' 'Item in expensis 'hominum transeuncium cum Patricio stulto, veniente de 'Anglia le Tarbart, 18 denarii.'

When we consider by what wide gaps great kings are separated, we cannot but regret, humanly, that power should have passed from such hands as those of Robert I. at the early age of fifty-five. We had David I., whose character grows on us by every new investigation, and whom Mr. Innes has done good service in expounding more fully to his countrymen, — Robert the Bruce and — William of Orange! James IV. was very far from being of the same degree with his great ancestor, but his character was a very interesting one, and it will not be rendered less so by the following particulars:—

'The connexion subsisting between James IV. and the burgesses of Dumbarton seems to have been of the most intimate nature. Hardly a year elapsed without his appearing among them, either as a resident in the castle or as a guest of some of the neighbouring nobles; while he almost invariably made the port the rendezvous for the different expeditions fitted out with the view of quieting his rebellious subjects in the Isles. By the aid of his carefully kept

Household Book, he may be seen watching his naval musters in the Leven, and afterwards amusing himself at the "battis" or the "cartis:" now hunting in the woods during the day, and then listening to the "evin-sang" at night in the chapel. Almost every item suggests a path of inquiry which the student of local or even national history may follow up with advantage, but need not be enlarged upon in this work.' (*History of Dumbartonshire*, p. 93, 94.)

From the copious extract given by Mr. Irving in his note we shall select a few entries. They are in the vernacular language of the time:—

'1497, April 24: "Giffen to ane cheild that brocht apills to the king fra the provost of Dunbartane, ix sh." 1501, July 2: "To the provost of Bothwell, that he gaef to the wif in Kirkintulloch, quhar the king drank, iij sh." 1504, April: "To John Forman, of the Wardrob, to pass fra Dunbartane to Strivelin, for the king's gere, 14 sh." "Ane Bard wif in Dunbartane, xvi d." 1503–4, April 18: "In Dunbartane, to Martin, the Frenchman, for x tun of wyne to the schippis vittaling in the Isles, ilk tun, lxx lib." 1504, May 18: "To the pyper of Dunbartane, xiv sh." 1505, May 1: "To ane man to pass with writings fra Strivelin to the *alderman* (provost?) of Dunbartane, iij sh." June 8: "To the king, to play at the cartis in Dunbartane with John Murray and Maister Robert Cockburne, iiij lib. x sh." "That samen nicht, to the evin-sang in the kirk to the king himsel in ane purse, xvi sh." 1505, July 23: "Item, that day, to ane man that brocht peirs to the king, iiij sh." Aug. 22: "To ane man that brocht in eggs to the king, ix." Dec. 8: "To bynding of Wallass's sword with cordis of silk and new hilt and plomet, new skabbard, and new hilt to the said sword, xxvj sh." (*Ibid.*, p. 94—96.)

The sword is still shown in Dumbarton Castle, but the scabbard and silk binding, Mr. Irving tells us, are among the things that were.

'1506, June 24: "To Andrew Bartoun, be the kinge's command, to mak hering to send to France for wyne, and to furneiss the schip biggit in Dunbartane to Burdeauss, jcvj lib. xiij sh. iv d." Aug. 13: "To the man that rowed the king over the water, iij sh." 1506–7: "To the maister wricht in Dunbartane to drink silver, xliij sh." July 24: "To Lord Averdaill, he laid down to men that brocht strawberries and uther berries to the king and quene, xiiij sh."' (*Ibid.*, p. 96.)

Like modern royalties, it would seem from the last entry that the royalty of Scotland carried no money; an arrangement in which it will be remembered that poor Beau Brummel was ambitious of imitating his 'stout friend.'

Dumbarton, the Alcluid of the Britons, the Theodosia of the Romans, is said by Geoffrey of Monmouth to have been the

residence of Ebraucus, the son of Menpricius, who reigned over Britain at the time when the Royal Psalmist swayed the sceptre of Judah! 'Without pinning our faith to this account of the matter, we have sufficient grounds for believing that, under the natural fortification which its rock supplied, there nestled an aggregate of human habitations on the site of the present town beyond all historical record. But it was not till 1221 that Dumbarton was erected into a royal burgh by Alexander II., at a time when the great city of Glasgow was a village, and its inhabitants merely 'the bishop's men.' The recorded proceedings of the Town Council are not very ancient, commencing, it would seem, only in 1627: and consequently are not comparable in interest with those of Aberdeen, recently published by the Spalding Club, which commence in 1398. But prior to this period there are some scattered Minutes which present a very minute and vivid picture of Scottish burgher life, and Mr. Irving has judged wisely in extracting from them as largely as he has done. We give as a specimen one or two passages from the portion which he has admitted into his text:—

'1604, June 2: John Maccauss is appointed "to strike the drum throu the toune at four hours in the morning and at six hours at nyt, and serve the toun in all their adois y^ik^ this time towmonth, and that for ane stand of claithes presentlie, bocht be the toun to him, and libertie grantit to him to pass throw the toun at Yule and Pasche, and to resaiff sic gratitude as the burgesses inhabitants thereof sall pleiss of their liberalitie to giff him." In April, 1601, the council "grantes to baith the menstrallis ane hundreth merks betwixt them at Witsonday and Mertimes, viz. 40 lib. to the drummer and 40 m. to the pypaire bye and besides their casualties of menstrallis." In 1606 there are many regulations to prevent persons infected with the "Pest" from coming into the town. 1608, Nov. 7: There was an earthquake sensible in several parts of the country, and so strongly felt at Dumbarton that "the people ran to the kirk, together with their minister, to cry to God, for they looked presentlie for destruction." 1609, 17 April: *Ghosts.* Marion Peter and Marion Ritchie "confessit that they maist ungoddlie fleit Peter Houstoun (thair maister) fainyeing themselffis to be gaistis and spirits, casting piggis, peitis, and stoippis up and down the house fra ane place to uthir threi sundrie nytis." They were condemned to stand two successive days on the cross and on the repentance stool in the church, to hear their confessions publicly read, and "thairafter to be banishet fra the burgh." 1610: A Dutch ship permitted to discharge timber at Port of the Rig, it being impossible to bring her to Dumbarton, from her great length, 110 feet.' (*History of Dumbartonshire*, p. 171. 173.)

In a subsequent chapter Mr. Irving has an interesting section on 'Dumbarton sixty years ago;' which may be regarded as a

sketch of Scottish provincial burgh life generally, almost to the period of the passing of the Reform Bill and the introduction of railways. Its leading characteristic seems to have been its intense provincialism.

'Among the first things which excite attention, in a retrospective glance of this kind, is the thoroughly provincial spirit which prevailed among all classes of the community. The burgh boundary was the horizon which circumscribed all the hopes and fears of the inhabitants. There their schemes centred; there their desires were gratified or disappointed. To the world lying beyond them they paid little regard, and its affairs rarely moved the burgesses out of their dull routine of existence. An occupation, like a portion of the heritable property, often descended from father to son for three or four generations; nay, it might not only be conducted by the same family, but the chances were that it was carried on in the same place and in the same manner as it had been by the original founder. Of course these remarks may be made to apply to many other provincial towns as well as Dumbarton; nor is it alleged that the burgh suffered directly to any extent from this extreme provincialism. It was rather a peculiarity of the time than the locality; but to the present generation it is one made strikingly apparent from the circumstance that the influences at present operating tend to a directly contrary result.' (*History of Dumbartonshire*, p. 253, 254.)

The only special claim which the burgher life of Dumbarton has on the interest of the world at large, arises from the fact that out of it sprung the family of which Tobias Smollett was a cadet; and to many readers, not the least acceptable part of Mr. Irving's book will be that which contains the 'Bonhill 'Genealogies;' commencing with John Smollett, who was a baillie, and occupied a prominent position as a merchant and shipowner in the burgh in the beginning of the sixteenth century, and coming down to the present member for the county of Dumbarton. Our author has assigned a not unduly disproportionate space to the illustrious author of 'Humphrey Clinker,' and in addition to a biography has furnished us with several very interesting letters never before published, addressed to his friend, Dr. John Moore of Glasgow, and a good engraving of him by Freeman, after Sir Joshua Reynolds. A pleasant glimpse into the cousinly relation which subsisted amongst the members of the family in Tobias's time is furnished by a letter of his to a kinsman, probably the then laird of Bonhill. It is given in a fac-simile of Smollett's very neat hand-writing (*Ibid.*, p. 335.).*

But the list of the parochial clergy, or 'succession of minis-

* The portion of the Smollett genealogy which relates to the novelist has since been printed for private circulation.

'ters,' as he calls it, which Mr. Irving has appended to his account of each separate parish, contains, in the case of the parish of Cardross, a name even more illustrious in literature than that of Smollett, we mean the family of Macaulay. Here is what the public may accept without hesitation as the true account of the family of the late Lord Macaulay, for three generations: —

'John M'Aulay was inducted minister of Cardross parish in 1774. He was born at Harris (where his father was minister) in 1720, and graduated as M.A. at King's College, Aberdeen. He was ordained minister of South Uist in 1745, and in the course of the same year acquired some notoriety in his district by furnishing information, through his father, which nearly led to the capture of Prince Charles. In 1756 John M'Aulay removed to Kismore, and nine years afterwards made a second change to Inverary, where he was minister when Dr. Johnson made his famous journey to the Hebrides. Owing to his connexion with what was known as the moderate party, M'Aulay's translation to Cardross met with considerable opposition from the ultra-Calvinistic section of the presbytery; but it was ultimately carried in the above year, 1774. He married Margaret, third daughter of Colin Campbell, of Inversregan, by whom he had twelve children, the youngest of whom, John, died in infancy. One of them entered the East India Company's service and rose to the rank of general; another, Zachary, resided for some years as a merchant in Sierra Leone, and, on returning to this country, became a prominent and useful member of the party then labouring for the abolition of slavery in the British possessions. By his marriage with Miss Mills, daughter of a Bristol merchant, Zachary had a son, Thomas Babington (now Lord Macaulay of Rothley), the distinguished critic and historian. A sister of Zachary married Thomas Babington, Esq., an English gentleman. John M'Aulay died minister of Cardross in 1789.' (*History of Dumbartonshire*, p. 475.)

It was this John M'Aulay who, according to Boswell, spent an evening with Dr. Johnson, and, like everybody else who did so, was run down by a paradox. 'When Dr. Johnson spoke 'of people whose principles were good, but whose practice was 'faulty, Mr. M'Aulay said, "He had no notion of people being 'in earnest in their good professions whose practice was not 'suitable to them." The Doctor grew warm and said, "Sir, 'are you so grossly ignorant of human nature as not to know 'that a man may be very sincere in good principle without 'having good practice?"'

If we could afford to linger over Mr. Irving's pages we could tell the reader from them the story of the guilty and persecuted McGregors, of the stout Macfarlanes of Arrochar, who, amongst other notabilities, produced an eminent antiquarian, and of the Dennistouns of Dennistoun, who produced a still more eminent

one, to whose labours, in the earlier phases of his literary career, this and many similar works have been largely indebted; but we must not forget that we have still one work to notice before closing our survey of the recent topographical literature of Scotland.

Mr. Pratt's 'Buchan' though a volume of smaller pretensions, and also, we must add, of inferior execution to Mr. Irving's, is not without many claims on our interest. An episcopal clergyman, writing on the old strongholds of episcopacy in Scotland, Mr. Pratt not only introduces us to a district which in this and some other respects differs from those which we have been considering, but presents it in a somewhat different point of view. There is not the slightest tinge of bigotry or bitterness in the book; but the subjects relating to his calling occupy a prominent place in Mr. Pratt's mind, and are naturally brought into prominent relief in a book which treats of Buchan. The character of this old-fashioned corner of Aberdeenshire, even as it exists in our day, is we believe very accurately embodied in the following quaint verses. They are by 'the ingenious and learned William Merton, A.M., some-'time Professor of Philosophy in the Marischal College of 'Aberdeen.'

> 'The people who this land possesses
> Live quietly and pay their cesses;
> They fear the Lord, and till the ground,
> And love a creed that's short and sound;
> 'Tis true their speech is not so pointed,
> Nor with screwed looks their face disjointed.
> If scant of theory, their practice
> Supplies that want, which most exact is.
> They are not fond of innovations,
> Nor covet much new reformations;
> They are not for new paths, but rather,
> Each one jogs after his old father.' (p. 92, 93.)

It is not surprising that many of the customs of Roman Catholic times should have lingered amongst such a population long after they had disappeared elsewhere, or that, even now, their traces should be discoverable.

'On the 2nd of May,' says Mr. Pratt, 'the eve of the *Rood-day*, it was customary to make small crosses of twigs of the rowan tree, and to place them over every aperture leading into the house, as a protection against evil spirits and malevolent influences:

> "Rowan tree and red thread
> Keep the witches frae their speed."

'Although the religious observance of the Christmas festivals had for some time been generally discontinued, yet their traditional in-

fluences were more or less felt down to the earlier portion of the present century. 'Up to this period it had been customary to cease from all kinds of manual labour during the three days of Christmas, O.S. Straw, termed the "yule straw," was provided for the cattle beforehand, fuel bsought into the houses from the peat stacks, cakes baked, beer brewed, and the mart — fatted ox or sheep — killed, in order that all might be ready to "hold yule," and to pay and receive visits of mutual congratulation.

'The same conventional respect was paid to *Good Friday.*' . . . 'The blacksmith especially was a bold man who ventured to lift a hammer, and his wife a bolder woman who dared to wear her apron on that day, since, according to tradition, it was a smith's wife that was employed to carry in her apron the nails which her husband had made for the tragedy on Mount Calvary.' (*Pratt's Buchan*, p. 20.)

The significant customs of placing a lighted candle beside the dead, on the morning of the day of interment, which on no account must be blown out, but left to expire of itself; and stopping the clock at the moment of death, are still observed in the district. Faster's Eve, or Shrove Tuesday, is still generally observed as a time of social festivity, and *Hallow Fires* are still kindled on the eve of *All Saints.* These hallow fires, Mr. Pratt tells us, present a singular and animated spectacle, from sixty to eighty of them being frequently seen from one point.

'The domestic salutations are frequently of a simple and primitive character. It is no uncommon thing for a person, on entering the house of another, to say, "Peace be here!" to which the reply is, "You are welcome." Or on his coming upon one employed in his lawful calling, to say, in the broad Buchan dialect, "Guid speed the "wark!" the rejoinder to which is, "Thank ye; I wish ye weel."' (*Ibid.*, p. 21, 22.)

The custom too, of giving their animals an additional feed on Christmas morning, from the feeling that even the irrational creatures ought to be made happy on the occasion of a festival which brought glad tidings of great joy, is still observed, and we hope will long continue to be observed, by these good people.

Buchan is a very bleak region, a circumstance however which by driving its inhabitants to seek their enjoyment, in their own mental resources rather than in the contemplation of external nature, has perhaps been not unfavourable to the development of that imaginative character which they exhibit. One of its parishes has been wholly overblown with sand, and the fact has been accounted for by a very interesting tradition.

'The traditionary tale of "The Sands of Forvce" is, that about four hundred years ago the proprietor to whom the parish then be-

longed, died, leaving his lands to his three daughters. In that lawless age the helpless orphans were, through fraud and violence, despoiled of their inheritance. Being thrown upon the world, they, in the bitterness of their feelings, prayed to heaven to avenge their wrongs, and to make the fair fields of which they had been so unjustly defrauded, worthless to the ravager and his posterity. An old rhyme embodies the malediction of the fair sufferers:

"Yf evyr maydenis malysone
Dyd licht upon drye laude,
Let nochte bee funde in Furvye's glebys
But thystl, bente, and sande."

'Time passed on, and still the prayer was unheard; but, at length, a furious storm arose which raged without intermission for nine days. The maiden's *weird* was accomplished, and the parish is a sandy desert.' (*Pratt's Buchan*, p. 245.)

The two principal towns in the district of Buchan are Peterhead and Fraserburgh. Neither of them is in any way remarkable, and our readers will probably share with us the astonishment which we felt when we learned for the first time from Mr. Pratt's work that it had been at one time proposed to make the latter the seat of an University. In 1601 Fraserburgh was erected into a free burgh of barony in favour of Sir Alexander Fraser of Philorth, who if not the founder, was the great patron and benefactor, of the place. Among other ample privileges, he obtained for himself and his successors the power 'of naming 'the magistrates and town-council, and of erecting an university, 'equal in privileges to any other in the kingdom' he and his heirs having 'the nomination of the principal, professors, and whole 'masters thereof.' 'In pursuance of this design,' Mr. Pratt continues, 'he commenced a large building at the west end of 'the town, the square tower of which was still in existence at no 'very remote period. In 1600, the General Assembly recommended a Mr. Charles Fairholme, or Ferme, the minister of 'Fraserburgh, "a great stickler for presbytery," as principal.' Whether it had anything to do with the religious bias of the nominee, or interference of the Assembly with Sir Alexander's prerogative, we cannot say; but the account of this attempt of the Assembly to nominate a principal thus abruptly concludes: 'Nothing farther was done.' With this significant intimation of its fortunes we lose sight of the University of Fraserburgh.

To many this proposal will seem a piece of mere quixotism, bred of the folly and vanity of a private brain. But we are not sure that they will be right in thus summarily disposing of Sir Alexander and his scheme. His means were manifestly inadequate to his end, and he consequently incurred the merited reproach of indiscretion. But if he had effected his

purpose — which a sum of money, insignificant in comparison with that which the founder of the most senseless religious sect raises without difficulty, would have enabled him to do,—and had succeeded in establishing a few seats of learning, however lowly, in this primitive district, it is by no means clear that he would not have conferred a very substantial favour not only on his native country, but on the cause of civilisation and progress throughout the whole world. That the residence of 'a principal, 'professors, and masters,' and of the small body of students whom they might have gathered around them, would have made Fraserburgh, at all events, a very different place from what Mr. Pratt describes, is plain enough; and no man can tell what new thoughts the leisure and tranquillity of such an abode might have engendered in a succession of active minds during the couple of centuries which have since elapsed.*

* In the postscript to his recent work Mr. Innes has excited our curiosity by telling us of a discovery which has been made connected with the district of Buchan since the publication of Mr. Pratt's book. In the public library at Cambridge a MS. of the Gospels has been found, which bears to have belonged to the Abbey of Deir, or Deer. Besides the Gospels, it is said to contain some forms of church service, and on the margins and blank vellum a few charters and memoranda of grants to the Church of Deir. 'These entries are of high 'antiquity, more ancient than any extant Scottish chartularies, and 'recording facts still more archaic, reaching, indeed, a period of his-'tory which neither charter nor chronicle among us touches, and of 'which we have had hitherto only a few glimpses from the older 'lives of the saints, or from the meagre notes of foreign annalists.' The memoranda are in a Celtic dialect, and the MS. is pronounced to be of the tenth century. Amongst other matters of greater general interest on which it is probable that this curious book — when given to the world by Mr. Bradshaw, who is now engaged in editing it — will throw light, it seems clear from Mr. Innes's report that it will establish the existence of a religious house at Deir, founded by disciples of Columba from Ily, ages before the Cistercian convent mentioned by Mr. Pratt, which was probably nothing more than a new and more liberal endowment, together with a change in the occupants of the previous establishment.

ART. VIII. — *On Obscure Diseases of the Brain and Disorders of the Mind, their incipient Symptoms, Pathology, Diagnosis, Treatment, and Prophylaxis.* By FORBES WINSLOW, M.D., D.C.L., Oxon. London: 1860.

THERE is one, and but one, organ of the human body the symptoms of disorganisation and the disturbed functions of which we read of with avidity and ponder over with wonder. The disorders which affect the material instrument of the mind result in consequences so momentous, follow paths so extraordinary, and present enigmas so countless, that the general reader may be excused for the curiosity with which he follows the physician in his details of morbid psychological curiosities, and hangs over the surgeon's scalpel as it searches out the pathological appearances from which they are presumed to spring.

The volume under notice is not by any means a mere collection of such facts; it claims the higher and more original duty of tracing out the various paths of departure from healthy conditions of brain, and of unmasking hidden phases of insanity. Here lies a whole realm of unbeaten ground, the value of which Dr. Winslow has been the first to draw public attention to, with a gravity the occasion requires. It is the opinion of many eminent physicians that the present century has witnessed a very large increase of brain disorders, and that this increase has taken place in an accelerated ratio as the strain upon the commercial and public life of the people has become greater. The intense competition which at present exists among all the liberal professions, the excitement accompanying the large monetary transactions which distinguish the trading of the present day, the gambling nature of many of its operations, and the extreme tension to which all classes of the community are subjected in the unceasing struggle for position and even life, has resulted in a cerebral excitement under which the finely organised brain but too often gives way.

Dr. Brigham, of Boston in the United States, gives a most deplorable account of the increase of cerebral disorders in his own country, in which he asserts that insanity and other brain diseases are three times as prevalent as in England. This statement would seem to confirm the notion that go-a-headism — if we may be allowed the term — is straining the mental fabric to its breaking point. And we must remember that the mischief must not be gauged merely by the number of those who fall by the wayside; there must be an enormous amount of latent mental exhaustion going on, which medicine takes no count of.

It is a matter of general observation that the children of men of intellectual eminence often possess feeble, if not diseased brains, for the simple reason that the parents have unduly exercised that organ. What applies to individuals, in a certain modified degree applies to the race. A generation that overtasks its brains is but too likely to be succeeded by a second still more enfeebled in its mental organisation, and this exhaustive process must go on increasing if the social causes producing it continue in operation.

We have some means of measuring the magnitude of the evil where absolute lunacy is concerned, inasmuch as we possess official returns to deal with, which gauge its rate of increase or decrease with pretty tolerable accuracy; but we have no such means of ascertaining the nature of the increase of those no less grave disorders of the brain which do not bring the patient under the cognisance of the law. If we could take count of the number of able men who, at the very height of their efficiency and in the very plenitude of their power, are struck with insidious cerebral disease, such as softening of the brain, and drop out of life as gradually and as noiselessly as the leaf slowly tinges, withers, and then flutters to the ground; if medicine had any system of statistics which could present us with a measure of the amount of paralysis that comes under its observation, or of the apoplectic seizures which so suddenly blot out life,—we should doubtless be astonished at the very large increase which has of late years taken place in affections of the brain. It is just possible that the tendency lately observable in the community to take a little more breath in the race of life, to prolong the annual holiday, and to favour the habit of physical exercise, of which the volunteer movement is a noble example, will do something to check the degenerating process at present undoubtedly going on: meanwhile we must see what we can do to remedy the existing evil. It is, we believe, within the province of art to arrest in its earlier stages many disorders of the brain if notice were only given in time; but the golden opportunity is allowed to slip, and disordered function slowly but surely merges into disordered organisation. We know full well that at least eighty per cent. of cases of insanity are curable if treated early; and we also know that of those received into the great county asylums scarcely ten per cent. ever recover. The difference between the two drop through into the condition of driveling idiots or of raving maniacs, simply because the curative influences of medicine has been sought too late. In some of the more obscure and fatal brain diseases, such as cerebral softening, general paralysis, epilepsy,

&c., the neglect of early treatment is equally deplorable. The insidious approaches of mischief are often foreshadowed by symptoms so trival that they pass unobserved by relatives and friends. The person so affected will frequently drop his stick or umbrella in his walk; he will in the slightest possible manner drag one leg, a finger will feel numb, or there will be some slight disorder of the sight.

'In the incipient stages (says Dr. Winslow) of cerebral softenings, as well as in organic disintegrations of the delicate nerve vesicle, observed in what is termed progressive, general, and cerebral paralysis, the patient often exhibits a debility of memory, long before the disease of the brain is suspected, in regard to the most ordinary and most trifling matters connected with the everyday occurrences of life; he forgets his appointments, is oblivious of names of his particular friends, mislays his books, loses his papers, and is unable to maintain in his mental grip for many consecutive minutes the name of the month or the day of the week. He sits down to write a letter on some matter of business, and his attention being for a second directed from what he is engaged in, he immediately loses all recollection of his correspondence, and leaves the letter unfinished. In this condition of mind he will be heard constantly inquiring for articles that he had carefully put aside but a few minutes previously.'

The memory may be considered one of the most delicate tests of the presence of injury, or the progress of natural decay, in the brain. From the hidden storehouse of impressions which we know to be seated in the cerebrum or greater brain whilst in a state of vigorous health, by the act of recollection we possess the marvellous power of reproducing the countless tableaux of scenes that have occurred during a long and busy life. Some persons never forget a face they have once seen, others will acquire with extreme rapidity a dozen languages containing hundreds of thousands of words, and store them for immediate use; the musician catches the floating notes of song, and they remain for a lifetime deeply graven on his memory. The artist packs away within his brain the image of the faintest flush of sunset or the thousand shades of sky, and reproduces them years after on his easel. It may be imagined that a tablet so sensitive to receive and so strong to retain an incredible number of images in a state of health is not unlikely to speedily make a 'sign' of its impaired condition. A flaw in an Egyptian slab covered with hieroglyphics is pretty sure to obliterate some of them, and experience proves that brain injury is speedily shadowed forth by defects more or less grave of the memory. In the whole range of psychological inquiry there is nothing more remarkable perhaps than the 'vagaries,' if we may be allowed the term, played by the deteriorating agent

in the storehouse of memory: sometimes it enters and for years annihilates the vast collection in an instant, only to restore them again as perfect as before; at other times it obliterates group after group of associated ideas in succession according to the order in which the brain has acquired them. Again a single letter in a word is all that the destroying power lays its hands upon among the immense magazine at its mercy. The chapter on the Diseases of Memory in Dr. Winslow's compendious and very interesting volume, is full of cases illustrative of the eccentricities presented to us by impaired and morbid memory: among the most remarkable of which is a case related by Dr. Graves of Dublin. A farmer in the county of Wicklow in consequence of a paralytic fit suffered the following extraordinary impairment of memory. He could readily call to mind all parts of speech except noun substantives and proper names. This defect was accompanied by the following singular peculiarity: he perfectly recollected the initial letter of every substantive or proper name for which he had occasion in conversation, though he could not recall to his memory the word itself. Experience had taught him the utility of having written in manuscript the things he was in the habit of calling for, or speaking about, including the proper names of his children, servants, and acquaintances; all these he arranged alphabetically in a little pocket dictionary which he used as follows—if he wished to ask for anything about a cow, before he commenced the sentence he turned to the letter C and looked at the word cow, and kept his finger and eye fixed upon the word until he had finished the sentence. He could pronounce the word cow in its proper place so long as he had his eye fixed upon the written letters; but the moment he shut the book it passed out of his memory, although he recollected its initial and could refer to it when necessary. Sometimes cerebral mischief is indicated by the mere transposition of letters. A gentleman on recovering from an attack of paralysis, for example, always said puc instead of cup, and gum instead of mug. It is very common for a person in ordinary speaking to use the wrong initial letter to a word; but the mind takes cognisance of the error as quick as thought and instantly reproduces the right letter, but in the wrong place: thus, in attempting to say a fat pig, if the tongue were to trip and say instead of fat, pat, the next word would inevitably be fig. The control of the healthy brain over minutiæ of this nature, and the automatic manner in which it is exercised, are thus clearly exemplified; but in disease such slips escape notice altogether. The records of psychological medicine are full of instances of defects

of memory equally trivial consequent upon lesion of the cerebrum. Thus, an old soldier, after suffering a loss of brain-matter from an operation, was found to have forgotten the numbers five and seven; and a schoolmaster consequent upon a brain-fever lost all knowledge of the letter F. Whilst disease sometimes touches the memory in this delicate manner, in its more active phases it seizes the organ with a rude and stifling grasp, and removes at once whole masses of carefully acquired knowledge. An Italian gentleman, master of three languages, struck with the yellow fever, exhibited in the course of it remarkable phenomena. At the beginning of his attack he spoke English, the language he had acquired last, in the middle of it French, and on the day before his death his native tongue. The total abolition of an acquired language is not at all an uncommon thing in brain disease, and as a rule the memory in such cases may be said to recede to those ideas engraven upon the memory in childhood. Those persons who have talked a foreign language all their lives will be found, to pray before death in their native tongue. There have been some remarkable exceptions to this rule, however, and Dr. Johnson when dying is said to have forgotten the Lord's Prayer in English, but to have attempted its repetition in Latin. Possibly the explanation of this exception may be found in the fact, that he thought habitually in Latin. There are not wanting instances, however, to prove that the memory under disease oscillates between the past and the present. For instance, Dr. Winslow records a case in which a gentleman after a serious attack of illness lost all recollection of recent events — his memory presented the tablet engraven with the images and ideas of his youth only; as he gained strength, however, the old and forgotten ones were revived. A still more remarkable instance of loss of memory and its sudden resuscitation we quote from Dr. Winslow's volume: —

'Reverend J. E., a clergyman of rare talent and energy, of sound education, while riding through his mountainous parish, was thrown violently from his carriage, and received a violent concussion of the brain. For several days he remained utterly unconscious; and at length when restored, his intellect was observed to be in a state like that of a naturally intelligent child, or like that of Casper Hauser after his long sequestration. He now in middle life commenced his English and classical studies under tutors, and was progressing very satisfactorily; when, after several months' successful study, the rich storehouses of his memory were gradually unlocked, so that in a few weeks his mind resumed all its wonted vigour, and its former wealth and polish of culture. The first evidence of the restoration of this gentleman's memory was experienced while attempt-

ing the mastery of an abstruse author, an intellectual effort well adapted to test the penetrability of that veil that so long had excluded from the mind the light and riches of its former hard-earned possessions.'

It would seem as though ideas were registered on the brain in successive layers, the last lying uppermost; and that as the nervous energy retreated, either as a consequence of disease or of gradual decay, so those ideas lost life *downwards*. The condition of the circulation of the blood through the brain in all probability has much to do with these changes in the vividness of the memory, as it is a known fact that some people recollect better by holding the head downwards; and Sir Henry Holland tells us that, after enduring great fatigue in descending one of the deep mines of the Hartz Mountains, he entirely lost his memory, which returned speedily again after he had taken rest and food. It is observable again that in morbidly active conditions of the cerebral circulation, such as occur in fever and on the approach of apoplexy, the memory is exalted in an extraordinary manner, and events are remembered with a vividness that is almost painful. In the rapid rush of the blood through the brain, that occurs in some excited stages of insanity, it has been remarked that patients have given signs of faculties which they had never evinced in a state of sanity; prosaic persons have suddenly become poetical, and those who normally had no head for figures, have in these conditions shown no ordinary aptitude for them. It would seem as though the blood when at this high pressure had penetrated portions of the brain hitherto but feebly supplied, and brought into cultivation cerebral wastes that were before barren. Dr. Winslow, in alluding to these exaltations of memory, draws the practical conclusion that in old persons these sudden lightings up of the memory should excite grave attention, as indicative of approaching fatal apoplexy.

We have yet to refer to a very extraordinary condition of brain which exists, in consequence of accidents producing concussion, in which memory, consciousness, and volition suffer for a time a complete annihilation, to be revived again at the exact stage at which they left off. A British captain, whilst giving orders at the battle of the Nile, was struck on the head and rendered senseless, in which condition he was taken home and remained at Greenwich Hospital for fifteen months, when the operation of trephining was performed, and the portion of the skull which pressed upon the brain was raised. Immediately consciousness returned, and he rose in his bed, and, without recognising where he was, finished giving the orders he had

commenced issuing amid the din of battle fifteen months before. Extraordinary as this case may appear, it is far from being an isolated one. Prichard relates an instance in which the mind stood still for years instead of months, and yet took up the train of thought exactly at the point at which it had been dropped. A New England farmer, whilst labouring under some dissatisfaction at having disposed of his farm at a rate he believed below its worth, was engaged by a neighbour to enclose a piece of land with a fence. In order to split the timber he was obliged to use a beetle and wedges. These, on finishing the labours of the day, he put into the hollow of a tree, intending to direct his son to bring them home. That night he was seized with delirium; in this condition he remained for several years, when his mental power was suddenly restored. The first question he asked was whether his sons had brought in the beetle. Apprehensive of bringing on a return of the disease by entering into explanations, they replied that they could not find them; whereupon the old man rose from his bed, went straight to the hollow tree, and found the wedges and the ring of the beetle, the beetle itself having mouldered away. Thus the delicate unused nerve vesicle, which retained the recollection of where the tools had been placed, remained intact whilst the solid wood had perished. Sometimes the memory, not only of the idea upon which the mind was last occupied, but the very action of the muscles arising out of it, has been retained in the mind like a fly in amber. Thus a young girl of six, whilst catching playthings thrown by a companion seated on the pavement, fell and received a cerebral concussion, which rendered her insensible for ten hours. When she opened her eyes she jumped to the head of the bed, and asking 'Where 'did you throw it?' immediately commenced throwing little articles of her dress from the bed, exclaiming, 'Catch these!' and from that moment was perfectly restored. The exactitude with which the fractured ends of the severed idea fit,—severed as we have seen sometimes for years,—is very remarkable, and go to prove that there must be in such cases an instantaneous arrest of the action of the nerve vesicles without morbid change however, otherwise they could not at a moment's notice resume their operation at the exact point at which they left off. We can only liken this extraordinary phenomenon of arrest of mind to some accident which has suddenly stopped a machine — the driving band has perhaps suddenly slipped off — and in this instance the driving band in all probability was the circulation of the blood through the brain—the motive power restored, the machine went on as before. That mechanical pressure upon

the surface of the brain, which means an exercise of control over its circulation, according to the degree in which it is exercised, will produce different mental conditions from perfect coma to perfect sensibility—is well known. A man in Paris once made a living by allowing curious physiologists to make experiments of this nature upon him. He had suffered the operation of trephining, and his brain was covered by a thin membrane only, by applying graduated pressure upon which the man's relations with the whole external world could be cut off and restored by the mere action of the finger. At the will of the operator he lived alternately the life of the highest order of animal, or that of a mere vegetable. There is a very remarkable condition of brain, in which the mind of the individual is possessed with a double consciousness. Alternate states arise as distinct in themselves as though they belonged to two individuals. Dr. Mitchell relates a case of this kind which is so extraordinary that we must be pardoned for quoting it entire.

'Miss R——, possessing naturally a very good constitution, arrived at adult age without having it impaired by disease. She possessed an excellent capacity, and enjoyed fair opportunities of acquiring knowledge. Besides the domestic arts and social attainments, she had improved her mind by reading and conversation, and was well versed in penmanship. Her memory was capacious, and stored with a copious stock of ideas. Unexpectedly and without any forewarning she fell into a profound sleep, which continued several hours beyond the ordinary time. On waking she was discovered to have lost every trace of acquired knowledge. Her memory was a *tabula rasa;* all vestiges, both of words and things, were obliterated and gone. It was found necessary for her to learn everything again. She even acquired, by new efforts, the art of spelling, reading, writing, and calculating, and gradually became acquainted with the persons and objects around, like a being for the first time brought into the world. In these exercises she made considerable progress. But after a few months another fit of somnolency invaded her. On rousing from it she found herself restored to the state she was in before the first paroxysm; but she was totally ignorant of every event and occurrence that had befallen her afterwards. The former condition of her existence she called the old state, and the latter the new state; and she was as unconscious of her double character as two distinct persons are of their respective natures. For example: in her old state she possessed all her original knowledge; in her new state only what she acquired since. If a gentleman or lady were introduced to her in the old state, and *vice versâ* (and so of all other matters), to know them satisfactorily she tried to learn them in both states. In the old state she possessed fine powers of penmanship, while in the new state she wrote a poor awkward hand, having not time or means to become expert. During four years and upwards she underwent periodical transitions from one of these states to the other. The alter-

nations were always consequent upon a sound sleep. Both the lady and her family were capable of conducting the affair without embarrassment. By simply knowing whether she was in the old or new state, they regulated the intercourse and governed themselves accordingly.'

If there is any truth in our hypothesis of the memory of impressions lying in layers, superimposed one upon another on the surface of the brain, the alternation of the child-like and the adult state of intelligence would be accounted for by supposing that the level of the power that vivified the nerve vesicles stamped with the mental impression, stood at different periods at different heights, retreating in the child-like state to the lowest ebb; and again remounting to its full intellectual height in the adult period.

There is no circumstance with regard to the human economy more remarkable than the tolerance sometimes exhibited by the brain, of grave lesions and disorders within its substance. The popular idea that to touch the sensorium is tantamount to annihilating the life, is a monstrous fallacy. Soldiers have been known to carry bullets in their brains without any serious inconvenience, and heroic operations are often performed upon the cerebral mass without injury to the patient. A surgeon lately informed us that he had a young stable-boy lately under his care, whose skull had been fractured by the kick of a horse and forced in upon the cerebral mass, so crushing it that a portion had to be removed; nevertheless the patient recovered, and it was remarkable that whereas, before the accident he had been subject to fits, and was rather a dull boy, after the accident he became much brighter, and continues so to this day. In all probability these fits were of an epileptiform character, owing to the pressure of a specula of bone upon the surface of the brain, and when this was removed by the operation, the cause that led to his dulness no longer existed. The kick of the horse was in fact the most fortunate thing that could have happened to him.

Dr. Ferrior relates the case of a man who retained all his faculties entire until the moment of his death, yet one half of whose brain was on examination discovered to have been destroyed by suppuration. Dr. Heberden tells us of a man who performed the ordinary duties of life with half a pound of water resting on his brain; and a still more remarkable case is mentioned by Dr. O'Halloran in which a man suffered an injury upon the head which caused the suppuration of the skull, through which nearly one half of the brain was discharged, mixed with matter, yet this man preserved his intellectual facul-

ties until the moment of his death. Nevertheless, we are inclined to agree with Dr. Winslow that even in these anomalous cases there must have been some disturbance of the mental powers observable, had the attention of a competent observer been directed to them, and that as a rule it will be found logically true, that wherever there has been found the trace of organic cerebral change, there also must have been manifestations of mental disturbance. It is not often that fracturing the skull proves a curative operation, but there can be little doubt that mere accidental shocks to the sick brain have proved far more effective than even the skill of the physician. 'I have been 'informed,' says Dr. Prichard, 'on good authority, that there 'was, some time since, a family consisting of three boys, 'who were all considered as idiots. One of them received a 'severe injury on the head; from that time his faculties began 'to brighten, and he is now a man of good talents, and practises 'as a barrister; his brothers are still idiotic and imbecile.' We have it on the authority of Petrarch, that a slight concussion of the brain wonderfully strengthened the memory of Pope Clement VI. It is equally certain that tumours have gone on slowly increasing within the substance of the brain itself without for a long time disturbing the mental power of the individual. The case of Dr. Wollaston is remarkably illustrative of this. His death was occasioned by a cerebral growth of this nature, which in all probability existed there from early youth, without perceptibly to ordinary observers affecting his intellect. At last it attained to such a large size that it encroached upon the cavities of the brain, and produced paralysis of one side of the body. Notwithstanding this his brain remained quite clear, and the last moments of his life were engaged in writing some figures in arithmetic progression, in order to convince his friends that, although his tongue was mute for ever, his brain was clear.

In the great majority of cases, however, *post mortem* examinations present but faint signs of any lesion of substance, even where the mind during life has been thoroughly disordered. The physician but too often seeks in vain in the lunatic's brain for any trace of disorganisation. He knows, nevertheless, that alterations of some kind must exist, and attributes his failure to the coarseness of the methods of examination at present employed. The scalpel alone will never find it out, and even the microscope as yet fails to detect departures from normal structure of so delicate a kind as those which are sufficient to overturn noble minds; and we entirely agree with Dr. Winslow in believing that, in order to detect the more subtle lesions of the

brain, we must call in the labours of the Chemico-Cerebral pathologist. Sir B. Brodie has shown that the nervous substance of the brain is distinguished from all other tissues (the bones excepted) by the very large proportion of phosphorus which it contains, amounting to no less than 1·5 per cent. in 100, and if we speak of the solid matter alone, the important position held by this chemical agent in the brain is still more apparent, no less than one-tenth of the whole being composed of phosphorus. It is a well-known fact that any laborious mental exercise, indeed any protracted exertion of the nervous system, results in a discharge of large quantities of the phosphatic salts by means of the kidneys; this circumstance taken together with the remarkable fact that in the brain of the adult idiot there is a very small amount of phosphorus — not more than in that of a child — points to the conclusion that it plays a very important part in the substance of the mental powers. That in the large majority of cases of insanity the blood is mainly in fault, there can be little doubt; but when we remember how slight an alteration in the constitution of the vital fluid will produce cerebral symptoms of a very marked character, we no longer wonder at the pertinacity with which these changes have eluded our observation. There are certain moments before dinner when most men suffer what the late Dr. Marshall Hall called the temper disease, the amiable become suddenly unamiable, and the best of us snappish; the morale of the individual is entirely altered. Want of rest, again, will so exhaust the mind that people positively are subject at such times to delusions, imagining their best friends are slighting them, and exhibiting in various ways quasi symptoms of insanity. We very much question, however, if chemists yet possess skill enough to detect the temporary errors of the blood, which we know must have given rise to this condition of things. Let us ask again, In what particular does the blood differ during sleep from that which it presents in the waking state? It contains, we know, a trifle more carbonic acid; but surely this addition will not account for the act of dreaming, in which we rehearse, as it were, in the inner world of the brain, the wildest thoughts of the insane.

If the pathologist is so often baffled in detecting actual disorganisation of the instrument through which mind is manifested, the alienist physician is rarely at a loss to read the symptoms that during life are sure to present themselves. Dr. Winslow has cultivated a new field of research in those chapters of his work, in which he treats of the incipient stages of brain disease. The public are apt to date the amount of mental disturbances from

some overt act, which has startled and compelled the attention of friends. Alas! the first overt act, in too many cases, has also been the last, and the verdict of suicide committed in a fit of temporary insanity is considered sufficient to exonerate all parties from any blame; but in every case the first overt act has been preceded by signs and portents of the patient's state of mind, which the experienced eye could not fail to detect. The ink is scarcely dry which recorded the suicide of a very able chancellor of a western diocese. On the inquest it was stated that he had been troubled in his mind for several days previous to the catastrophe by an error of 2*s.* 7*d.* which he had made in his diocesan accounts. This symptom of a departure from the well-known ordinary masculine tone of his mind would have suggested to any skilful physician the necessity for having him placed under surveillance; had such a step been taken, his friends probably would not have had to lament his loss. It may be urged, we know, that if we refine too much in this direction, the merest effects of temper and exhibitions of eccentricity which constitute character will at last be looked upon and watched with suspicion, as indicating a tendency to mental disease, and that those only will be considered to be sane, who possess ordinary level minds without sufficient originality to go out of the beaten track. Such an error in reasoning no well-educated physician would be guilty of; but he would note with extreme suspicion any sudden change of a man's settled habits or revolution in his modes of thought. As Dr. Andrew Combe remarks: —

'It is the prolonged departure, without any adequate external 'cause, from the state of feeling and mode of thinking usual to 'the individual when in health, that is the true feature of dis-'order in mind; and the degree in which this disorder ought to 'be held as constituting insanity, is a question of another kind, 'and which we can scarcely hope for unanimity of sentiment 'upon.'

There are very many cases, however, in which insanity shows itself by a simple exaggeration of usually healthy conditions. In these cases the physician finds the greatest difficulty in saying where the line shall be drawn which shall bring the patient under the eye of the law. The naturally passionate man becomes outrageous, the religious person becomes fanatical, the vain exceedingly boastful, the liberal extravagant; the only departure from the ordinary mental condition in these cases, is an extraordinary exaltation of the passions and emotions. It is cases such as these which produce so much misery in the domestic circles, inasmuch as the present state of the lunacy law

does not justify their being placed under control. A person thus affected may with impunity squander his whole substance and bring his family to ruin; he may render them miserable for years by the most unfounded suspicions; he may bring disgrace upon his name by exercising that excess of the secretive power which finds its climax in meaningless petty thefts. The condition of sanity and insanity in such cases graduate so imperceptibly into each other, that the physician scarcely dares to give a certificate of insanity; and many families are forced to stand idly by whilst they see themselves irretrievably devoted to ruin, merely because the rigid rules of the lunacy law cannot be made flexible enough to meet the ever-varying phenomena of diseased mind.

The difficulty of discovering the physical cause of many forms of insanity is easily accounted for, if Dr. Winslow is right in his hypothesis that there is such a thing as a co-ordinating mental power, the disease of which is liable to produce the strongest psychological eccentricities. The later physiologists hold that the physical actions are governed, as it were, by a special power which is believed to reside in the cerebellum, or lesser brain; and the disease popularly known as St. Vitus's Dance is supposed on very good grounds to arise in consequence of a derangement of that power. The patient cannot conduct the food to his mouth; his legs go every way but the right one when he attempts to walk; he makes the oddest grimaces when asked to look you in the face; and in short, is so incapable of performing one act of volition as he should do, that the disease is aptly called 'the insanity of the muscles.' The extraordinary physical exertion performed by persons so affected is almost beyond belief. Dr. Abercrombie relates the case of a lady who would sometimes throw her whole body into a kind of convulsive spring, by which she would leap as a fish may do, from the floor on to the top of a wardrobe full five feet high; at other times she would rotate her head for several weeks together. Others have been known to rapidly rotate the whole body for a month continuously; one extraordinary case is on record in which a young girl became possessed with the idea of standing upon her head with her feet perpendicularly upwards; as soon as she had accomplished this position she fell as if paralysed, and then commenced the same action again, continuing it fifteen times in a minute for fifteen hours in the day! Insanity of the muscles is indeed an appropriate name to give to such an affection. Having contemplated the frightful effect of disease of the co-ordinating power, let us for a moment consider the exquisite nicety with which that power, when in health, adjusts the

muscles to perform any specific act. Let us take for example the muscles of the arm of Paganini in drawing forth the exquisite tones of his violin. It is almost impossible to conceive the precision and *aplomb* with which different groups of muscles must have been directed to produce the delicate shades of music he called forth by a simple act of volition, yet this accuracy, however often repeated, never failed him. Let us grant that there is some co-ordinating power — some executive presiding over the just association of our ideas — and there is no incoherence for which its disease may not be held responsible.

'There is no fixed or even transient delusion,' says Dr. Winslow in the case of Psychical Chorea. 'In these cases the insanity appears to depend upon a disordered state of the co-ordinating power (eliminated in all probability in the cerebrum) and paralysis of what may be designated the executive, or to adopt the phraseology of Sir William Hamilton, regulative, or legislative faculties of the mind. The patient so affected deals in the most inexplicable absurd combinations of ideas. Filthy ejaculations, terrible oaths, blasphemous expressions, wild denunciations of hatred, revenge, and contempt, allusions the most obscene, are often singularly mingled with the most exalted sentiments of love, affection, virtue, purity, and religion . . . I have often known patients whilst suffering from the choreic type of insanity, alternately to spit, bite, caress, kiss, vilify, and praise those near them, and to utter one moment sentiments that would do honour to the most orthodox divines, and immediately afterwards to use language only expected to proceed from the mouths of the most depraved of human beings. This phase of mental aberration is often seen unassociated with any form of delusion, hallucination, or illusion.'

What the nature of this mental regulative force may be we know no more than we do of the muscular co-ordinating power. Physical methods of inquiry tell us nothing, and cannot be expected to do so.

It has been said by Cicero that if it had been so ordered by nature that we should do in sleep all we dream of doing, every man would have to be bound down before going to bed. It does seem remarkable that during one-third of our lives we should be liable to a derangement of the mental power (for such is dreaming), which in our waking state would render us liable to be placed in a lunatic asylum. The very intimate connexion undoubtedly existing between dreaming and insanity has in all times attracted the attention of psychologists, and of late physiologists have directed their attention to the physical conditions which give rise to the former very remarkable state. Dr. Marshall Hall believed that sleep is produced either by some constriction of the great vessels of the neck, or by a sluggishness of the

respiratory organs, either cause leading to a venous condition of the blood calculated to produce somnolency. We know that every degree of insensibility, up to complete coma, can be produced by simply allowing the neck to rest with the weight of the trunk against a tightened cord. Nature has, therefore, only to contract the great vessels periodically to bring about the state of things we so readily do artificially; but sleeping is not dreaming says the reader. Certainly not; but it is the dark background on which the pattern of our dreams is woven, and in all probability the condition of the circulation through the brain which produces it is also answerable for the diversified pattern itself. The absence of volition, says Dr. Darwin, distinguishes the state of sleep from the waking state. This proposition is, however, rather too sweeping, for in all probability there is no such thing as perfect sleep or absence of volition, any more than there is any position in which every muscle of the body is totally at rest; at all events in dreaming there are many reasons which lead us to conclude that the different portions of the brain sleep unequally, and this inequality possibly arises from the position of the head, directing a fuller flow of blood to one part of the brain than to others, or from its detention in given portions. If we examine a dream narrowly we find that volition may or may not be excited, according to the nature of the excitement created in the mind by the illusion passing before it. For instance, it often happens that we dream we are pursued by a mad bull or by an assassin, and the greatest distress is occasioned by finding that we can neither call out or run away. It again often happens to us that we dream we are suddenly falling down a precipice; but here volition is as it were suddenly wakened out of its sleep, for we find that, in the endeavour to save ourselves from falling, we jump *up* in the bed. We have here a proof that volition does not rest so soundly, but that it can be roughly and suddenly shaken into life. In somnambulism it is actively awake, although consciousness is perfectly dormant. There is also such a thing as day-mare—a condition of the brain which exists just as we are waking from sleep, when we are perfectly conscious, but unable either to move or to call out, volition in fact has slept longer than the other faculties of the brain. It is noteworthy, that sleeping on the back is generally assigned as a cause of nightmare, or that condition in which action seems most obstinately bent upon not answering the appeals made to it. This fact certainly seems favourable to a belief that position has something to do with the unequal manner in which the different faculties of the brain rest during sleep. The seat of

the muscular co-ordinating power, the cerebellum in the recumbent position, may possibly suffer congestion in consequence of its lying partially under the cerebrum. The state of reverie or of day-dreaming presents many features which are very analogous to that of mental aberration. Except that we are conscious of our abandoning the fancy to its own will, this condition differs but little from that of dreaming. An indulgence in this habit tends to emasculate the mind. When long continued it is often, says Dr. Winslow, precursory of softening of the brain, and of the incipient stages of some types of mental disorders. Disraeli, in his 'Contarina Flemming,' has with intuitive genius seen this truth: —

'I have sometimes,' he says, 'half believed, although the suspicion is mortifying, that there is only a step between his state who deeply indulges in imaginative meditation, and insanity; for I well remember when I indulged in meditation to an extreme degree, that my senses appeared sometimes to be wandering. I cannot describe the peculiar feelings I then experienced . . . but I think it was that I was not always assured of my identity or even existence; for I found it necessary to shout aloud to be sure that I lived; and I was in the habit very often at night of taking down a volume and looking into it for my name, to be convinced that I had not been dreaming of myself.'

We may allude to one faculty of the brain which appears always to remain dormant during dreams: we allude to the faculty of wonder. The most incongruous images, the oddest combination of circumstances, the strangest persons present themselves before us at such times unchallenged. We converse with friends and relations long since dead, without feeling the least surprised at their resurrection. And why is this? Because the sense of the fitness of things is also wanting. How can we wonder when the standard of judgment is absent. And herein we find the extraordinary likeness between dreaming and certain forms of insanity. The co-ordinating psychical power in both cases is in abeyance. Sir Walter Scott has shrewdly said, that the only difference between the two states is, that in dreams the horses have run away with the coach whilst the coachman is asleep; in lunacy the runaway takes place whilst the coachman is drunk. This distinction is a nice one, but the effect upon the coach in the two cases is so remarkably alike, with the single exception of the absence of volition in the former, that we think the psychologist is justified in considering them associated phenomena of mind.

There have not been wanting cases indeed in which the first outbreak of insanity commenced in a dream.

'A gentleman (says Dr. Winslow) who had previously manifested no appreciable symptoms of mental disorder, or even of disturbed and anxious thought, retired to bed apparently in a sane state of mind; upon rising in the morning, to the intense horror of his wife, he was found to have lost his senses! He exhibited his insanity by asserting that he was going to be tried for an offence which he could not clearly define, and of the nature of which he had no right conception. He declared that the officers of justice were in hot pursuit of him; in fact, he maintained that they were actually in the house. He begged and implored his wife to protect him. He walked about the bedroom in a state of great apprehension and alarm, stamping his feet and wringing his hands in the wildest agony of despair. Upon inquiring into the history of the case, his wife said that she had not observed any symptom that excited her suspicion as to the state of her husband's mind; but upon being questioned very closely, she admitted that during the previous night he appeared to have been under the influence of what she considered to be the nightmare or a frightful dream. Whilst apparently asleep, he cried out several times, evidently in great distress of mind — "Don't "come near me!" "Take them away!" "Oh save me, they are "pursuing me!" It is singular that in this case the insanity which was clearly manifested in the morning appeared like *a continuation of the same character and train of perturbed thought that existed during his troubled sleep*, when, according to his wife's account, he was evidently dreaming.'

Sir Benjamin Brodie has referred in his Psychological Inquiry, to a very remarkable quality in the brain, a quality Dr. Carpenter terms unconscious cerebration. It often happens that after accumulating a number of facts in an inquiry, the mind becomes so confused in contemplating them, that it is incapable of proceeding with its labours of arrangement and elaboration; dismayed at the chaotic heap, it backs as it were upon itself, and we feel certain that it is of no use cudgelling our dull brains any longer. After a little while, however, without having once consciously recurred to the subject, we find to our surprise that the confusion which involved the question has entirely subsided, and every fact has fallen into its right place. Is it possible that the brain can, without our knowledge, select and eliminate, aggregate, and segregate facts as subtilely as the digestive organs act upon the food introduced to the stomach? Sir Henry Holland is inclined to dissent from such a conclusion, and leans rather to the explanation of the phenomenon which Sir B. Brodie has himself suggested, viz., that the seeming ordering process may be accounted for by supposing that all the unnecessary facts fade from the memory, whilst those which are essential for the ultimate arrangement and classification of the subject under consideration are left clear of the weeds that before en-

cumbered them. But this explanation involves a confession of an eliminative process going on unconsciously in the brain which appears to us to be little less wonderful than a hidden cogitation. Why should the unessential facts alone fade? We see no reason why we should refuse to recognise masked operations of mind. Surely we see every day examples of cerebral acts being performed of which the individual is afterwards totally oblivious. Let us instance, for example, the mental impressions engraved with a searing iron, as it were, upon the brain in the moments of delirium. Under chloroform, again, the mind is often in a state of great exaltation, and goes through mental labour of a kind calculated, one would imagine, to leave lasting traces behind it on the memory; nevertheless wafer does not more readily give up impressions made upon it than does the tablet of the brain under this influence. Even in dreams, of which we take no note, but which are patent to bystanders by our speech and actions, there must be plenty of 'unconscious 'cerebration.' Indeed, Sir Henry Holland, in referring to a vague feeling that all of us at times have experienced when engaged in any particular act, that 'we have gone through it 'all before,' endeavours to explain it by supposing that the faint shadow of a dream has suddenly and for the first time come to our recollection in a form so unusual that it seems as though we had acted the part before in another world. That we go through brain-work unconsciously we have therefore no doubt; and we see no reason why we should deny the existence of a power seated in the brain, whose duty it is silently to sift the grain from the husk in the immense mass of mental pabulum supplied to it by the senses.

There can be found no more curious chapter in the history of the human body and mind than that which relates to the phenomenon of morbid attention directed to its different organs. The power of influencing any particular portion of the animal economy by the concentration of our attention upon it, is so marvellous that we wonder the method of its action has not been more thoroughly investigated than it appears to have been. It would seem as though the mind possessed the power of modifying the functions of distant parts of the body, and of exciting sensations quite independently of any act of volition. The mere act of attention to any particular organ over which we possess no muscular control is sufficient to produce some alteration of its functions. Thus we may will that a spot in the skin shall itch, and it will itch, if we can only localise our attention upon the point sufficiently; by directing our thoughts to the heart it rapidly beats; by soliciting the lower intestine it

is quickly brought into action. There is scarcely an organ of the body which is not liable to be interfered with by simply concentrating the attention upon it. Whole regions of superficial nerves, such as those of the skin in the neck, may be exalted in their action to the highest degree by the mere expectation of being tickled there. This nervous attention may become so persistent as to cause actual disease. We have a familiar instance in dyspepsia, where the patient is for ever thinking of his stomach, and at last diseased function degenerates into diseased organisation, and he falls into the condition of a helpless hypochondriac. But if an attitude of concentrated attention upon his mere animal functions is thus capable of producing disease in them, what effect has it upon the mind itself? Sir Henry Holland has remarked that it appears to be a condition of our wonderful existence that while we can safely use our faculties in exploring every part of outward nature, that we cannot sustain those powers when directed inward to the source and centre of their operations—in other words, the mind, when it persists for any length of time in analysing itself, scorpion like, stings and destroys its own action. That we can as readily injure our brains as our stomachs by pertinaciously directing our attention to fancied diseases in them cannot be doubted, and that mere perversion of ordinary modes of thought, such as may exist in minds only functionally disordered, may be fixed by the action of morbid attention so as to constitute permanent aberration, is equally certain. Hence as Dr. Winslow says, 'the extreme danger of not exercising like trustworthy 'sentinels a watchful supervision and active controlling in-'fluence over every thought, and the evil that arises from not 'keeping in a state of strict subordination the mental emotions. 'The fearful mischief from neglecting by resolute mental efforts 'to battle with the erratic suggestions of an unduly excited and 'flighty imagination, to keep in abeyance and even to strangle 'in their birth unhealthy impressions struggling to fix and en-'graft themselves upon the easily moulded, plastic and yielding 'fancy, cannot be over-estimated or exaggerated.' And let it not be supposed that this is needless advice, or that it is a rare thing to find reason struggling manfully with the promptings of insanity. Bishop Butler tells us that he was all his life struggling against devilish suggestions, and nothing but the sternest watchfulness enabled him to beat down thoughts that otherwise would have maddened him. His case was but an example of that of thousands of persons with whom we come in contact every day, who under a calm exterior conceal conflicts between the reason and the first promptings of insanity of the most terrible kind.

It is not within the province of this article to enter into the professional treatment necessary to combat the various forms of cerebral mischief so graphically detailed in Dr. Winslow's volume, which to the general reader is as interesting as a romance, whilst to the psychologist it is fraught with the deepest interest, not only as a storehouse of fact bearing upon brain disorganisation, but also as a philosophical exposition of the fine and graduated links which connect healthy and disordered minds. But it will be at least consolatory to those who view with alarm the symptoms of increased cerebral disorders in the community, that the means of grappling the evil are not wanting. 'I am satisfied,' says the author, 'that it is in our power 'to arrest the progress of the fatal cerebral disorganisation that 'so often follows, after the lapse of years, injuries to the head, 'if we do not sleep at our posts, and are on the look out for the 'first scintillations of brain disorders, for, as Dr. Grieves has 'sagaciously said, "It is not enough to treat them when they '"come, THEY MUST BE SEEN AND MET COMING."'

ART. IX.—1. *Compendium of 'The Impending Crisis of the South.'* By HINTON ROWAN HELPER, of North Carolina. New York: 1860.

2. *Civilised America.* By THOS. COLLEY GRATTAN. London: 1859.

3. *Life of Stephen A. Douglas.* By JAMES W. SHEAHAN. London: 1860.

4. *The Barbarism of Slavery. A Speech of Hon. Charles Sumner, on the Bill for the Admission of Kansas as a Free State. In the United States Senate, June 4th,* 1860.

5. *Oration of Hon. Edward Everett, at Boston, on the 4th July,* 1860.

IF the question is frankly put to any sensible and instructed man in England, what we ought to care most about of all that is going on in the world outside our own country, he will answer, the conduct and fortunes of the United States. Our interest, however, does not correspond with our sense of the importance of American affairs to the world and to ourselves. A movement in Italy, a word spoken by Switzerland, a sign of mutual confidence among the German Powers, or a change of mood in the French newspapers, excites and

occupies more attention in England than events of the greatest moment and indications of the deepest significance in the United States. We need no convincing that the prospects of every civilised nation depend, to an incalculable extent, on the issue of the ostensible experiment of self-government instituted in the great Republic; and that the subsistence of four millions of our people is implicated with the cotton-growing of half the States of the Union; yet we have to overcome a sensation of weariness and distaste before we can throw our minds into the study of American affairs, even during a crisis like the present. There are reasons for this distaste, so obvious as to require only the briefest reference. We are perplexed by the incessant growth of new parties, and by the unintelligible character of most of them. We are disgusted by the virulence of party language throughout the country, and annoyed at the captious temper and bickering tendencies of the Washington Government in its relations with its allies, and especially with ourselves. Again, some among us who might not otherwise dislike an exposure of the faults and sufferings of the republican nation, apprehend disaster to freedom from any calamitous issue of the great enterprise inaugurated by Washington and his peers; and the best friends of civil liberty feel so painfully the shortcomings and transgressions of the Government in the United States, as to desire to evade the subject whenever they can. All this is wrong, however. We are bound by every consideration to inform ourselves of the true state of American affairs: and it is certain that the subject becomes, as is usual, more interesting the better it is understood; and that it has not, for a long course of years, been so easily intelligible as during the Presidential election of 1860. Much more than the immediate fate of the Republic may hang on the choice of the next President: events of a decisive character must happen during his term of rule, as during that of Mr. Buchanan; and as if the critical nature of the action of the next few months were universally understood, the arbitrary divisions of party have disappeared, and we see the nation massing itself in the two large divisions which must always be found under a system of representative government. It is not our business at the moment to make a study of these parties; much less to venture on any course of prophecy as to the results of the conflict. We refer to the reduction of a crowd of parties to the two called Democratic and Republican,—to which some may think the Union party worthy to be added,—merely to show how the case is simplified to the foreign observer. As for the rest, we shall confine ourselves to a cursory notice of the phenomena of Mr. Buchanan's administration,

and of the state of affairs to which the new President will succeed.

Four years ago there seemed reason to hope that the American people were becoming sensible of the evil of choosing for their rulers obscure men, appointed for some special object of convenience, and by the very conditions of their elevation certain to be mere tools of their party. Polk and Pierce would be better forgotten, if that were possible; but Mr. Buchanan was known in statesmanship at home and abroad, was practised in political life at European Courts, as well as in Congress at Washington, and was understood to have excited favourable expectations among the allies of the Republic, in spite of the misgivings inspired by his share in the Ostend Manifesto. He was an educated man: he had entered early into political life, having appeared as a representative in his own State (Pennsylvania) at three-and-twenty, and in Congress at thirty, years of age. After his mission to Russia, under General Jackson's administration, he became a member of the Senate, conspicuous for his business-like qualities and his accomplishments. His reputation preceded him when he came to England as Minister in 1854; and if some speculations were excited by the appointment, it was among the few only who understood what must be the tendencies of the politician who could be a Secretary of State under Mr. Polk. The annexation of Texas was the final cause of Mr. Polk's presidentship, and no man could be a member of his Cabinet who was not pledged to a policy of territorial aggrandisement, for the sake of the extension of slavery. The Oregon question was under the management of Mr. Buchanan as soon as he entered the Cabinet, and the mode of conducting that negotiation is fairly conveyed in Mr. Grattan's account of the matter: —

'A new subject of dispute with England, the Oregon question, was soon involved in the intricacies of a diplomatic correspondence, in which, as usual, the Americans had the best of the argument, owing chiefly, as I believe (from the best English authority), to the very ingenious (not ingenuous) manner in which it was handled by the then Secretary of State, who is now in his turn the present President.' (*Civilised America*, vol. ii. p. 444.)

Here at length was a new President of whom the question could not be asked, as it was generally asked, of Mr. Polk,— who he was. On the Inauguration day of 1845, there was a shout of laughter from end to end of Pennsylvania Avenue, in spite of the solemnity of the occasion. A person in the crowd cried out 'Who is James Polk?' and the cry was repeated among the thousands present, till the new President himself

could not resist the absurdity of such a reception, and laughed as heartily as his neighbours. Nobody asked 'Who is James 'Buchanan?' when his turn came. Everybody knew him. Whether he was really as simple as a novice in his reading of the phenomena of the State, or whether his smooth expectations and sanguine hopes were an affectation, is as yet a matter of opinion. The phenomena of the period were these:—

As the domestic politics of the United States determine the foreign relations, we mention the domestic facts first.

Mr. Buchanan was the eighteenth choice of the Republic for President,—twelve terms having been occupied by Southern slaveholders and six by Northern men,—non-slaveholders, of course, but, in local language, nearly all 'Northern men with 'Southern principles.' No Northern man has ever been re-elected; but five slaveholders have served twice. As Mr. Buchanan had no reforms to propose, his policy was marked out by these facts, as much as by the Ostend Manifesto. Five years before, the number of slaveholders in the country was 347,000; and their connexions might swell the number immediately interested in slavery to 2,000,000; while the rest of the population (excluding the slaves) amounted to 22,000,000. Mr. Buchanan was elected in the interest of the minority; and he lost no time in intimating that his policy would be regulated in favour of that interest. If this appears astonishing, we can only remind our readers that the Republican party of the present day was then in its infancy; and that, of the 20,000,000 of non-slaveholders, the larger proportion were politically paralysed by fear;—fear of an explosion of the Union; fear for their commerce; fear of the disgrace of civil war. Again, a large number were as yet unawakened on the vital question of the Republic; and, above all, the three-fifths franchise possessed by the Slave States,—the franchise based on property and not on numbers,—has always conferred a vast disproportion of political power on the Southern population. Mr. Buchanan's policy was to take any advantage which might accrue from his Northern birth and connexions, while lending his utmost aid to carry the Southern States over the difficulties which were menacing them with a deposition from power, after their long course of oligarchical government. This was done with so much audacity, and the election was conducted in a manner so singularly corrupt, as to develop, on the instant, the Republican party which now proposes a reversal of the Southern policy. A recent speech of Mr. Sumner's, on the origin, necessity, and permanence of the Republican party, exhibits the mode in which the flagrant corruption of Mr. Buchanan's electioneering

machinery created the party in 1854; and how the yet more flagrant corruption of his administration has since wrought to increase the numbers and the influence of the party of reform.

The great controversy of the day, whatever it be, always turns in the United States, on the constitutional question. The fathers of the Republic hoped that a written constitution would make all safe,—as so many have supposed in other cases, before and since, in the Old World and the New; but, when it became necessary to provide for the interpretation of the constitution, it was clear that the security was imaginary. The strife about the limitations of Federal and State rights is never ending; and never was the struggle more desperate than when Mr. Buchanan came into power. We need not enlarge on the disturbances occasioned by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the passage and attempted enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law, and those demands of the South for the prevalence of slave-institutions throughout the Republic, which were agitating the whole country at the time of Mr. Buchanan's inauguration. While, on the one hand, the new laws were regarded as unconstitutional on the very face of them, on the other, stringent demands were made for their vigorous enforcement: there were incessant conflicts in the streets and the courts between kidnappers and the protectors of negroes; in Boston, chains had been drawn round the court-house; cannon had been placed in the streets; a black resident had been yielded up, amidst general mourning that there had been no adequate organisation for resistance; and a clear warning was given to the Southern intruders that this was the last reddition under the Fugitive Slave Law that would ever be made in Massachusetts. A similar turmoil had been witnessed in many States when Mr. Buchanan delivered his Inauguration Address; and the world was not a little curious to see what a President from Pennsylvania would make of such a state of things. All were not aware of the tacit understanding which had existed for some time between him and the Supreme Court.

It has since become known that the decision of the Court on the DRED SCOTT Case had been formed for some months, and communicated to those whom it most concerned. It was suppressed during the election, and the following winter, from the fear of injuring Mr. Buchanan's prospects first, and next, embarrassing his entrance upon the Presidentship. In his Inauguration Address he professed ignorance of the nature of the decision, but so earnestly exhorted the people to a reverent acceptance of it as to satisfy his hearers as to what they had to expect. Four days afterwards, the celebrated judgment was

announced, and the nation was informed that slavery existed everywhere in the Republic but where it was locally repudiated; that it was a Federal institution, without exception or reversal. The Democratic party, headed by the President, assumed the controversy between the North and South to be settled by this judgment; while others denied, not only the constitutional character of the decision, but its being a binding decision at all, because it was extra-judicial. The majority of the Court had pronounced at the outset that Scott had no right to bring his case before them; and after this, it was said, their further conclusions were nothing more than the opinions of the judges on a case which was not within their jurisdiction. On Mr. Buchanan's accession to office, therefore, the struggles of many parties had just been converted into a distinct and circumscribed conflict between two,—the Northern and Southern, or the Anti-slavery and Pro-slavery parties. The Republican party was vigorous, for its age,—only two years and some months. It had failed in carrying the election of Colonel Fremont; but it was Mr. Buchanan's main cause of solicitude in his entrance upon office.

While every man of the multitude who heard him on that portentous 4th of March, 1857, was aware that the sectional antagonism would be concentrated and exasperated by the decision on the DRED SCOTT Case, the President congratulated the nation, in a tone of pious and patriotic satisfaction, on the 'calm' that would be spread over the whole area of society by that unrevealed decision. All strifes and troubles would now cease; and henceforth all would be well with everybody. He should have the happiness of conducting the affairs of a united nation, and should retire, at the close of his term, into the state of repose congenial to his years, satisfied that all serious troubles and dangers were surmounted or averted, and that a career of honour and glory lay open before the Republic. Those who best know the Presidential orator were of opinion that his real hope was to defer the inevitable struggle to the time of his successor; and to amuse the people meanwhile with the acquisition of Cuba, and the turn of his foreign policy, in Central America and Mexico, as well as Europe. However this may be, he assumed that all troublesome questions would be laid to rest at his bidding, and under the authority of the Supreme Court.

What was the actual condition of the strife to be thus suddenly stilled? A glance at the facts is necessary to any true understanding of the new President's views and policy. Unhappily those facts are only too interesting.

The newspapers of that period exhibited an array of narra-

tives and appeals from persons who had been rudely deprived of their right, under the Constitution, to travel wherever they chose over the area of the States, and to settle and pursue their callings at pleasure. Some were driven away without notice, leaving their property behind them: some were imprisoned illegally, some tried farcically, some tarred and feathered, or otherwise punished without trial; all these being immigrants or travellers in the Slave States, coming from the Free States in virtue of their constitutional rights. In each case the victim was accused of some dislike to Slavery, manifested or suspected, and in nine cases out of ten, suspected only. Throughout the South, there was a restless uneasiness about the negroes. The North knew nothing about it, having no means of judging; but the slaveholders dreaded revolt on their estates. The frontier Slave States were beginning to hint at the course they should take in case of a dissolution of the Union,—Virginia, for one, finding the drain of negroes from the frontier so ruinous to her slave-breeding trade, that something must be done to save her fortunes from destruction. While the slaves were being marched away to the South every day, and free labourers were entering from the North to buy the lands that were lapsing into wilderness, it seemed probable that Virginia might find it necessary to join the Free States when the moment came for a decision; and Virginia was sure to be followed by the other frontier States in any course she took. The annual Commercial Conventions in the South complained of poverty, denounced the arrogant prosperity of the Free States, and demanded aid and redress from Government, while the entire North was indignant at the total disregard of the constitution and the laws on the part of the Federal Government, and its southern supporters. In Kansas a civil war was going on, more like a series of Red Indian incursions than a struggle for political objects. In the Free States, there were perpetual collisions between the Federal authorities and the citizens of various States, about the new laws which those citizens had never acknowledged; and, on the other hand, an agitation was spreading in the South, among the least controllable part of the white population, in favour of the revival of the African slave-trade. The Governor of South Carolina was not the only high state functionary who led the movement of the landless whites against the planters. A Disunion Convention had been held in Massachusetts, the leading State of New England. Several Southern States had, throughout the Presidential election, propounded schemes of marching on Washington, in case of Colonel Fremont's success, seizing the archives, and assuming the government, and bring-

ing the political quarrel to the issue of civil war. When their candidate succeeded, they declared their scheme adjourned over another Presidential term: it would be resumed on the first prospect of the success of an anti-slavery candidate. As to the temper of Congress itself, we need only point to the murderous assault on Mr. Sumner, in the Senate, in the preceding May, and the result of his appeal to the laws on that occasion. These are only a few of the social phenomena of the time: but they will suffice to enable any reader to form an opinion of the new President's sincerity or soundness of judgment in promising a great calm as the characteristic of his term of office.

As to foreign affairs, the most conspicuous point was Cuba. The ambition of Mr. Buchanan's life has been to connect his name with the annexation of Cuba to the United States. For this object he underwent the obloquy attaching to the Ostend Manifesto, and for this he ran the risk of avowing his favourite project before he could accurately calculate his chances of success. He thus set out under the disadvantage of the suspicion of Europe, and the discredit of being the accomplice of the late American Minister in Spain, Mr. Soulé, in his bullying and tricky course. Mr. Soulé was recalled; but the taint of his disgrace hung about Mr. Buchanan. On the same grounds his conduct in regard to the filibuster Walker and his comrades was narrowly watched, and believed to be as friendly to the pirates as events soon proved it to be. The Central American question was likely to be a troublesome one, it was evident. As to the European Powers, they were incommoded by the refusal of the Washington Government to sign the declaration of the Treaty of Paris in regard to privateering in time of war; and England had just been annoyed by the dismissal of her Minister and two consuls, on the ground of their having infringed upon the American law relating to foreign enlistment. The Clayton-Bulwer treaty was an instrument always at hand when a wrangle with a foreign State was convenient, and 'the Monroe 'doctrine' was serving something like the same purpose at Washington as the Immaculate Conception at Rome. A new or revived dogma is a godsend in troubled political times, and one was extracted from a saying of President Monroe's, which he would no more recognise in its new dress than Jefferson or Adams would recognise a modern presidential election as the offspring of the constitution they superintended in its early workings. There was the Dallas-Clarendon treaty, growing out of the other, and relating to the dispute about the Mosquito Territory. There was occasional trouble about the Northwestern boundary, and about Fishery rights: and thus a

state of irritation had long existed between our Government and that of Washington. Spain was dissatisfied about both Mexico and Cuba; and American claims against the Spanish Exchequer were urged with great vigour, with a view to an ostensible purchase of Cuba.

Such was the condition of affairs in the United States when Mr. Buchanan undertook to carry them on. Next, we have to note the course of his policy, and the events which marked that course.

I. The strength and activity of the Republican party was one of the earliest phenomena of the term; and its vigour indicated one main feature of Mr. Buchanan's policy, — its method of corruption. That party, say its leading men, was created by the corruption of the Democratic party, which Mr. Buchanan (before he was discarded by it) called 'the only national and 'Conservative party.' Mr. Sumner says, in a speech of July last, at New York: —

'Is is now an attested fact that Mr. Buchanan became President through corruption. Money, familiarly known as a "corruption "fund," first distilled in small drippings from clerks and petty officials, was swollen by the larger contributions of merchants and contractors; and with this accumulation votes were purchased in Philadelphia, enough to turn the election in that great metropolis, and, in the chain of cause and effect, to assure the triumph of the Democratic candidate. I speak only what has been proved. Fraudulent naturalisation papers in blank, by which this was perpetrated, have been produced before a Committee of Congress. It was natural that an Administration thus corrupt in origin should continue to exercise power through the same corruption by which power was gained; but nothing else than that insensibility to acts of shame which is bred by familiarity can explain how all this should be done with such absolute indecency of exposure.' (*Speech before the Young Men's Republican Union of New York.*)

The story of the ensuing corruptions is so well known in Europe that a mere reference will answer our purpose here. Money ran out of the treasury so fast, the business of the nation was so badly done by newly appointed superintendents, clerks, engineers, artisans, &c. that observation was excited. Passing events in Kansas disclosed the amount of corruption that the President and his Cabinet were capable of countenancing; and the cry became so loud that Mr. Buchanan wrote the famous letter to Pittsburg, which remains a mystery to simple-minded readers on this side the water. In that letter the President foreshadows the overthrow of the Republic as a probable — even an almost inevitable event — through the strifes of the citizens, and, yet more, the fearful corruption which he declares

to be prevalent throughout the whole body politic. The horror expressed at this corruption is extreme; and the writer, speaking from his position as head of the State, declares that such is the unworthiness of the existing generation of sons of the founders of the Republic, that the only apparent alternative before them is a lapse into a social chaos or a dumb submission to a military despotism. While we, in Europe, were asking one another what this dismal arraignment and prophecy could mean from such a hand, disclosures were in progress in the President's own neighbourhood which have made the Republican party what it is, and have rendered it impossible for the Democratic party to do anything but discard their own President, when they were sounded about supporting him for a second term of office. The House of Representatives at Washington at length appointed a committee to inquire into the truth of allegations of official corruption; and the committee went to work. The President remonstrated, declaring that the proceeding was unconstitutional, and that the only way was to impeach him. The House asserted its own right to ascertain the existence of material before committing itself to an impeachment; and the inquiry went on. Its general results have been much talked of, in this country as in every other; and our readers will particularly remember it as the main theme of Lord Grey's speech of April last on Democratic Government. We should rather ascribe the evils he denounced to the oligarchical than the democratic character of the American party, in its actual operation; but Lord Grey was secure in respect to his facts, as regarded official corruption in the United States, as a single instance may here suffice to show.

'A letter from a local politician (Mr. Sumner tells us out of the published evidence) addressed to the President himself, urging without disguise the giving of a large contract for machinery to a particular house in Philadelphia, employing 450 mechanics, with a view to the approaching election, was sent to the Secretary of the Navy, with this endorsement, in a well-known handwriting, signed by well-known initials, — "September 15. 1858. The en- "closed letter from Colonel Patterson of Philadelphia is submitted "to the attention of the Secretary of the Navy. J. B." Thus did the President of the United States, in formal written words, now on record in the history of the country, recommend the employment of the public money, set apart for the public service, to influence an election. Here was corruption as positive as when his supporters purchased votes in the streets. From one learn all; and from such a characteristic instance learn the character of the Administration.' (*Sumner's Speech in New York.*)

The entire mass of evidence before the Covode Committee

(so called from the Member who obtained its appointment) went to prove that the country was governed by 'bribers and 'bribees,' from the Custom House porters to the Cabinet itself; and it has never since been disputed that corruption is a distinguishing feature of the policy of Mr. Buchanan. The latest disclosure of the sort of traffic to which official men are considered pledged, is afforded by a circular recently posted all over Ohio. This circular reminds all who hold official positions that they are expected to contribute not less than the value of 10*l.* to the expenses of the election of the Democratic candidate for the Presidentship. The audacity seems to have grown with the corruption.

II. A natural commentary on Mr. Buchanan's declaration that the Dred Scott decision had settled the slavery question was afforded without delay. Instead of 'calm,' the Southern and Western newspapers soon gave hints that something was wrong in Tennessee, something wrong in Kentucky, in Arkansas, in Missouri, in Louisiana, where gentlemen could not get their proper night's rest, and families did not know whether to go home for the winter as usual, or protract their summer absence at watering places. By November the troubles were past concealment; though we are still told that not one half that happened is known, because there is danger in publishing the facts. The news flew through the Southern States that Vigilance Committees were formed, and patrols of planters kept always moving along the Cumberland River in Tennessee. An insurrection was declared to have been planned in the iron works there, and to have spread along the rivers to an unknown extent. Negroes were flogged to death, to extort confession, — in so many cases in vain that it seemed doubtful whether the alarm had any solid foundation. This time, however, there certainly was an insurrectionary spirit among the negroes, extending over six or seven States. Up to this date there had been no insurrectionary movement since 1832, when the rise of abolitionism in the North reassured and quieted the minds of the slaves. From that time the frequent revolts stopped entirely; and the periodical alarms of the planters and other citizens were always found to be baseless. It will be recorded that the calamity of slave revolts reappeared under Mr. Buchanan's rule, and not accidentally. By the testimony of all parties, the election orators of the South were answerable for the disorders of the autumn and winter of 1857. They had made speeches to multitudes throughout the Slave States, in which they had dwelt on the certainty of the abolition of slavery if Fremont were elected. They insisted on the menacing appearance of

the Republican party, and the necessity of every Southern man exerting himself, if the planters would not see their property and their domestic authority wrenched from their grasp. The imprudence of all this was repeatedly urged upon the orators: but the mischief was done before they could be checked. In every listening crowd there were negroes who, being unable to read, and never addressed on political topics, were all the more eager to catch what they could by the ear; and they spread the news in whispers over many States, that the day of emancipation was at hand. Their disappointment at the result of the election was aggravated by the Dred Scott decision; and in despair they no doubt planned some desperate proceeding. Then came the horrors which we need not describe, — the torturing to induce confession, the hanging of men in long rows, some with, and more without, the pretence of a trial; the hunting of itinerant traders and of strangers of any quality and complexion; the hanging of one lonely white man here, of two there, of three or four elsewhere; the terror and cruelty of wives and mothers, and the rage of husbands and fathers, fevered with fatigue and vigilance, and excited to the point of believing most easily the wildest threats and informations. Even they declare that there were 'no overt acts,' and that they proceeded on 'presumptive evidence;' but not the less was the spirit of murder, and the shock of treachery, and the thirst of vindictiveness running riot on every estate through which the great western rivers run. In the Atlantic Slave States, and on the Gulf, the negroes were forbidden public worship, and kept at home; and the disclosures necessarily made of the misery of this way of living in one's own house did not help to reconcile the Northern citizens to the new doctrine that the whole country was saddled with slave institutions for ever.

III. The functionaries of Mr. Buchanan's Government did not promote the 'calm' announced by the head of the State. Mr. Cass, Secretary of State, began to refuse passports to persons of colour who wished to travel abroad. A Massachusetts' physician was the first we hear of who encountered this consequence of the Dred Scott decision; and the American Minister in London has not scrupled to keep up the practice so begun. The Executive of Massachusetts at once took the portentous step of granting passports in such cases; and here was a ground of disunion at once. The supposed right of pre-emption of the public lands, hitherto enjoyed by persons of colour, was now denied, though the Secretary of the Interior had declared, a few months before, that 'the laws of the 'country made, in this respect, no distinction between pur-

'chasers of different races.' In opposition to a decision in Mr. Madison's time, and to constant practice, it was now announced that no man of colour could register a vessel owned by himself, nor command a vessel sailing under United States marine papers. On application, a shipowner was actually refused a permit to sail his own vessel, and the port officers were instructed to prevent any but white men acting as masters of any ship. This new exclusion of free negroes from old departments of industry increased the social restlessness of the time.

One State Legislature after another was repudiating the decision of the Supreme Court, and one capital city after another was practically refusing to obey its mandates. We have not space for the various narratives; and it must suffice to say that over a large part of the Union, and where the greatest amount of intelligence and patriotism is always looked for, there has never been any acceptance of the Dred Scott decision, nor, of course, of the policy which is grounded upon it. Mr. Buchanan seems to have imagined that by carrying matters with a high hand in Kansas, he might at once gratify the Southern party and subdue the Northern. This part of his policy will perhaps always be regarded as the most characteristic; and it will be the most conspicuous because out of it arose the antagonism which has left him politically stranded.

IV. There is no need to explain that Kansas was, several years ago, pointed out to universal observation as the field on which the conflict between the authors and opponents of the modern pro-slavery policy and legislation would be fought out; nor need we go over again the dreary story of the wrongs inflicted on the settlers in Kansas by bands of marauders from over the frontier, and the hired 'mean whites' engaged in the South by the planters to go and secure a footing for slave establishments in the new territory. We have heard enough of stuffed ballot-boxes, imaginary constituencies, incendiarism, kidnapping, murder, and the hunger and misery which follow civil wars of so barbarous a character. The point was reached at last at Washington that the people of Kansas should have the power of voting for or against a constitution directly submitted to them. Mr. Douglas, who had risen to the position of leader of the Democratic party, avowed that the President, the Legislature, himself and his party, were pledged to this. Mr. Buchanan admitted the pledge, on his own part, by appointing Robert J. Walker to be Governor of Kansas, in spite of the strongest reluctance on the part of Mr. Walker.

'Mr. Douglas,' says his biographer, 'was particularly anxious for

the appointment of Mr. Walker, and took an active part in inducing him to consent to go to Kansas as Governor. After long and serious consideration, Mr. Walker accepted the office; in so doing he placed a condition on file that he was to be Governor with the assurance that he was to tell the people of Kansas that they should have the privilege of voting directly for or against any constitution that might be prepared for them. He proceeded to Kansas; and in his speeches he repeated this pledge, and in so doing stated that he made it with the knowledge and approval of the President and his cabinet; and that, unless the constitution was submitted to the people for ratification or rejection, he should endeavour to defeat it before Congress.

'Mr. Douglas, in Illinois, by speeches delivered at various parts of the State, referred to Governor Walker's course as a proof that the pledges he had made during the previous year, that Mr. Buchanan would faithfully carry out the spirit of 'the Kansas-Nebraska Act, were about to be redeemed to their letter.' (*Life of Stephen A. Douglas*, p. 313).

There were two constitutions in Kansas, framed and passed respectively by the settlers, and by the intruders who possessed themselves periodically of the polling places and ballot-boxes; but the new Governor distinctly and repeatedly made a declaration, that in October (1857) there should be elections for the Territory, and for a delegate to Congress, on a fresh and free basis. The unanimous will and action of the *bonâ fide* residents were opposed by a foreign body, who undertook to establish slavery on the soil; and the notorious Lecompton constitution was accepted from its concoctors at Washington, and declared to be the work of the people of Kansas. The Governor did not act with sufficient directness and vigour; but he exposed the frauds by which four hundred votes were returned from a place which contained only forty-three voters, and a thousand votes from another (Oxford) which contained only forty-two voters; and once more, twelve hundred from Shawnee, inhabited by only forty citizens. From the hour of his rebuke of these frauds, Governor Walker found himself out of favour at Washington. The President, at whose entreaty he had accepted his appointment, at first sustained him. He wrote to Governor Walker sometimes familiar letters, and sometimes more formal despatches, alike inducing his functionary to rely on his support. 'Let Georgia and Alabama and Mississippi howl,' he wrote, 'I will stand by you.' The graver epistle is too long to be presented here. The pith of it, offered in various forms, is this:—'On the question of submitting the Constitution to the 'actual *bonâ fide* residents of Kansas, I am willing to stand or 'fall.' He has fallen; but by deserting, not adhering to, that pledge. The date of this letter is the 12th of July, 1857. Its

concluding sentence is:—'The pressure upon me continues 'without intermission. I pray the Divine Providence, in which 'I place my trust, may graciously preserve my life and my health 'until the end of my term. But God's will be done in any 'event.' • • •

The ink of this letter was scarcely dry when the Governor found himself out of office, on the very ground of his support of its principles, and of his own and the President's pledges. He went to Washington, and found that the President had gone over to the 'howling' party, instead of standing by him. Mr. Buchanan, next December, pressed the illegal constitution on Congress, alleging that he had supposed it would be submitted to the people, but that there was no power anywhere to compel such an appeal. The double action in Kansas continued: the residents refused to vote under an illegal compulsion: and they did vote under their own legislature and arrangements, declaring the penalty of death against any one who should obey the usurping authorities, and the constitution they had set up.

At this juncture occurred that split in the Democratic party which is now determining the course of the Presidential Election, the policy of the next four years, and probably the fate of the Union.

Mr. Douglas had long identified himself with the principle of 'popular sovereignty:' and he avows an intention that his name shall be distinguished by a strict fidelity to it. While, on the one hand, it is insisted that slavery is a normal condition of the Republic, and on the other, that Congress is able, and is bound by the arrangements of a former generation, to refuse the privileges of the Union to States which have a pro-slavery constitution, Mr. Douglas claims that the citizens of each State shall choose their own institutions, without prejudice to their admission to the Union. It is not our business here to discuss these several views; and it cannot be necessary to describe the position in which the President's change of policy left Mr. Douglas. The two men had long been close allies,—Mr. Douglas's support being of more consequence to Mr. Buchanan than anything that Mr. Buchanan had to give could possibly be to Mr. Douglas. If Mr. Buchanan supposed that his ally could go over to the lawless party with him, he was fatally mistaken.

Mr. Douglas is a Northern man by birth, a Western man by residence, habits, and political standing, and a Southern man in policy, and perhaps inclination. He is not a slaveholder, having refused a bequest of negroes, and let them be assigned to his children; but he has supported all the pro-slavery legislation of late years, up to the point of the Lecompton constitution for

Kansas. He had hitherto every reason to expect the support of the Democratic party at the South, through his aid to the Fugitive Slave Law, and other new laws made in their interest. Now he suddenly found himself divided from those supporters by Mr. Buchanan's greater subservience to them, and he must choose his footing for the rest of his career. He had created the Democratic party in his own State, Illinois, and carried it to the feet of Mr. Buchanan, and he had been the great champion of the President, and the winner of his battles all over the Union. There was nothing to be done, however, but to hold to his distinctive doctrine on an occasion of keen probation like this. He declared his disapproval of the conduct of the Government as gently as he could. For a short time it was imagined that the breach might be repaired: but this was impossible. Mr. Buchanan failed in his attempt to saddle Kansas with the pseudo constitution; and now, in the last year of his term of office, the affairs of Kansas remain to be settled, and are as doubtful and dangerous as ever. It was in asserting the right of the people of Kansas to reject slavery and its institutions, that Mr. Sumner was struck down in the Senate in the May before Mr. Buchanan's election; and it is in continuation of the same suspended argument that now, after four years of suffering from the assault, Mr. Sumner, in the June before Mr. Buchanan's retirement, has delivered the noble speech on the Barbarism of Slavery, which will be an event in the history of American politics. As for Mr. Buchanan, in deserting to the South on the subject of Kansas, he forfeited his political reputation, and he lost his best ally. In return, he gained nothing. The South, for whose favour he sacrificed so much, is not benefited by the sacrifice, and would prefer for President a Northern man who should effectually suppress the slave-trade, or a man of its own way of thinking, who should be able to cope with the spirit of the North. Mr. Buchanan is neither the one nor the other; and he leaves the country more disturbed than he found it; therefore he is deserted in that quarter as in the North and the West.

V. This brings us to the consideration of Mr. Buchanan's policy, domestic and foreign, in regard to the Slave-trade.

Some of the leading newspapers of the Free States have lately been publishing lists of the mercantile houses known to have been engaged in the slave-trade, and of the vessels employed in that traffic, during Mr. Buchanan's term of office. This is not a fresh disclosure. The facts were well known before, and never better than when Mr. Secretary Cass was writing that letter to Mr. Dallas on the slave-trade, which came

out so awkwardly in Parliament and the newspapers last April, when the aspect of affairs in the United States had so changed as to give a very ugly look to the Washington despatches of the preceding year. In February, 1859, Mr. Buchanan's Cabinet insisted that the complaints of the extensive use of the American flag to cover slave-trading were unfounded; that the United States had done all that was possible, and that it was the business of England to control Spain and the Cuban trade, and set up preventive means in Africa; that every country has to submit to occasional violations of its laws; that if the American Government has sent out fewer guns than the treaty required, it must have been because there were other means of overawing the slavers; that it could not be true that the naval officers of the United States could have fallen short of their duty, and that 'the glory 'of their navy' was a sufficient defence against the charge; and above all, that the slave-trade is not in fact piracy, but conventionally made so by individual governments, which therefore ought to be allowed to deal with it without interference from any quarter whatever.

Such was the view professed in February, 1859, just a year after an exposure had been made of the actual conduct of the United States ships on the African coast. Large vessels were sent, which could not get near the shore, while occupying the beat, and permitting no cruisers of a more serviceable size to go where only they could be useful. From the Congo River alone 1000 negroes per month were carried off, under cover of the American flag. Only two or three vessels were on the coast at one time — three months' absence being allowed under pretext of 'the fever,' and that term being often and largely exceeded; so that the African coast service was scrambled for by officers who liked the fun of holiday-making at Madeira, the Canaries, the Cape de Verdes, and St. Helena. Upright officers were glad to avoid a service in which their instructions were vague, and their action so restricted as to stultify their position. Such were the disclosures made by Americans on the spot, in 1858. 'Five-sixths of the slave ships sail from New York,' says this authority; and the statement is followed by sketches of slave-trading white society as it exists in Africa. The comment of the Secretary of State, Mr. Cass, was that the penalty of this artificial offence was Death; but he did not add that the penalty had never been inflicted. Before his paltering letter was communicated to the British Parliament and public, it had become necessary for the Washington Cabinet to change its tone altogether. We have not space to show the reasons of the change; and it must suffice to say that in the interval a ran-

corous strife had arisen between the 'mean whites' of the South who, after seeing one cargo of captured Africans, clamoured for cheap negroes — and the planters, who desired to retain their monopoly of negro labour. It was by this time understood that, if driven to a choice, the slaveholders would prefer a Northern man who would put down the slave-trade to any candidate who would give the multitude of their impoverished neighbours a chance of competing with them by inundating the cotton States with a cheap negro immigration. The Cabinet, Congress, and the political public had in a few weeks said more about the fulfilment of treaty obligations than had been uttered from the day the treaty was made: the stories of 'British outrages' in the Gulf were admitted to be ridiculous exaggerations: inquiries were made in the legislatures about the honour of the American flag, and the sternness of duty spread itself over the demeanour of naval commanders in the African service: public virtue was appealed to against pirates and smugglers; fifty vessels were, by a vote of Congress, to be built expressly for effective cruising on the African coast; and the President announced that the laws must be obeyed. Within the last month we have been put in possession of Mr. Buchanan's reply to Lord John Russell's proposals of methods for an effectual watch in the Cuban waters. The definite project is rejected, but there is an end of the tone which was so offensive in the despatch of February, 1859. The serious stir made at home, the fact that Spain is about to send ten new steamers to the coast of Cuba, to guard it from clandestine importations under the American flag, and the forbearance with which England bears the vacillations of the United States' Government, for the sake of the object, must preclude any immediate repetition of such impertinence as Mr. Cass undertakes to express. Such is the latest aspect of an affair which, in the spring of 1858, looked very threatening. All the world knows now that the cruising of our ships in Cuban waters was a suggestion of Mr. Buchanan's Government; and Americans are not likely to forget that when, taking advantage of the popular wrath about imaginary 'British outrages,' Mr. Buchanan asked for new powers from Congress, in order to defend or avenge American rights in an emergency, he was refused. Loud as was the temporary clamour, it did not so confound the senses of Congress as to induce them to confer on the President new and unconstitutional powers. As for the rest, two or three cargoes of negroes have been recaptured and carried to the United States, to the great embarrassment of all the parties concerned. One set was sent to Liberia, and found to be a very inconvenient expense.

Another has been recently reported as dying off fast at Key West, while waiting for means of transport to Africa: but it has oozed out that, though many may have died, the greater number of coffins interred were empty—representing negroes who were not dead or sick, but learning cotton cultivation in the interior. The novelty of the spectacle of recaptured slaves at once shows what the inefficiency of American cruising has hitherto been, and opens a new difficulty to the rulers of a Federal union, the members of which are in a state of violent antagonism on the question whether negro labour shall be slave or free. At present the professions of the Government are in favour of an observance of the laws at home, and of treaties abroad.

In connexion with this change an event of great significance has marked Mr. Buchanan's term of office—the movement of the citizens of many of the States against the free negroes residing among them. As this incident merely follows in the train of the action of the Cabinet on the slave-trade, and does not directly involve the President, we may pass it over with a mere reference. Our readers will remember, by means of Lord Brougham's denunciation of the tyranny in the House of Lords, if not otherwise, that in Arkansas and several other States the whole free coloured population was driven out at short notice; in some cases the able-bodied being sold into slavery, while the old people, the children, and most of the women were expelled, not knowing where to go or what to do, and without any means of converting into money the houses or other property that they left behind. No act like this has been perpetrated by any civilised Power within living memory; and the story would fill a volume,—as painful an one as could well be written: but it was not a matter which concerned the Federal Government. Each State acted for itself, and in its own name defied the abhorrence of the world. The part of the case that did demand some attention from Mr. Buchanan was that this exodus was preceded by so many schemes for getting rid of the free negroes, by contract at so much per head, to the West Indies, or by transference to Africa, on one pretence or another, as to occasion or disclose a great laxity about the rights of these free people over themselves. Between these ways, in the Slave States, of disposing of their neighbours without asking their leave, and the rapid increase of the practice of kidnapping in the Free States, the barbarising influences of the Dred Scott decision have become manifest in Mr. Buchanan's time to an extent which will characterise his period of rule very unfavourably.

'But all these phases of Mr. Buchanan's administration are 'only various aspects of the controversy about slavery,' some of

our readers may suggest. This is very true; but we cannot help it. Every public movement in the United States is, and long has been, determined by the immediate condition of the Slavery question; and that question supplies the whole group of tests by which the political conduct of every public man will necessarily be tried till the controversy is extinguished in one way or another.

VI. To gratify those, however, who may think they have heard enough of Mr. Buchanan's relations to slavery, we will turn to his own special topic,—his intended acquisition of Cuba and other outlying territory. Let us see what has been done in his own field of ambition.

There was a time when Mr. Buchanan had reason to believe that he could most effectually obtain the support of the Southern Democracy by proposing the annexation of Cuba as the next great fact in the history of the Republic; but changes have taken place which have left him stranded on this, as on other questions. The Cuban enterprise was begun in the same way as the Texan and Mexican;—that is, by first endeavouring to stir up discontent, and then entering the territory by force of arms on pretext of aiding the malcontents against an oppressive government. Lopez, the leader in the first serious attempt on Cuba, could not find any malcontents to support him, and died garotted on the scaffold. By degrees the project has assumed a commercial character. The alleged grievances are commercial, and 'the solution' is to be 'by purchase.' From year to year Mr. Buchanan has announced in his Messages that Spain was vexing the Republic, ending his narrative with an intimation that money would be wanted for the purchase of Cuba; or, less confidently, that measures must be taken for the acquisition of an island which is now an annoyance, instead of a great blessing, to the United States; or, more recently, that Cuba will no doubt, sooner or later, belong to the United States; and that to get it by purchase is the only method worthy of a great people. Thus has the urgency of the question declined as the Spanish nation has risen in prosperity and importance. The wrath of the authorities in Spain and Cuba, and of the Spanish ambassador at Washington, at the insult of the President's Messages to Congress about buying what Spain did not mean to sell, seemed at first to produce no effect on Mr. Buchanan's serenity: but now that he finds Spain preparing for the defence, and his southern constituents at feud about the acquisition, of Cuba, some deprecating it more vehemently than others desire it, he pretends to let the question down gently, and to admit that he will have to leave office with this object also unaccomplished.

VII. The truth appears to be that experience has imposed some check on the passion for territorial aggrandisement in the Slave States, and among the floating population of adventurers which the northern cities are glad to get rid of on any pretence. One consequence of the change is, that the authorities at Washington have undergone some damaging exposures. Members of either House of Congress, in their courses of itinerant oratory, undertaken to rouse the old ambition of the South, have added a final touch of persuasion, which to foreign observers, looks very strange;—a hint, or an open declaration, that the views put forth were those of the President. The eyes of the world were naturally fixed on Mr. Buchanan and his Cabinet, when Walker the filibuster left New Orleans to invade Central America, in opposition to the President's proclamation. That proclamation called on all good citizens to prevent the aggression; and Commodore Paulding, strong in his professional orders, in addition, followed the pirates, did his duty, frustrated the expedition; and brought home the leaders as prisoners. Walker, and his comrades remained some time at Washington, and then left, unpunished, to begin 'a lecturing 'tour' in the Slave States. In New Orleans Walker offered to produce evidence that he undertook his late enterprise under Mr. Buchanan's express sanction; and at Mobile, he declared that the reason of the withdrawal of the President's countenance was that his chief comrade and himself had declined a mission to Mexico, to kindle war, with a view to the annexation of Cuba. The boasts of such men are hardly worth listening to; and no credit would perhaps have been given to these statements if the President had not been made manifestly uneasy by them, without commissioning his Ministers to disprove them. In a few months, Mr. Buchanan's own views and propositions, grounded on the miscalled Monroe doctrine, were sufficiently wild, in regard to Central American affairs, to alter the aspect of the statements of the filibusters, Walker and Henningsen: and then they came forward again.

Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Buchanan's minister at Mexico, was the proprietor and editor of the 'Mobile Register;' and to that newspaper Walker addressed his disclosures, which were to this effect: that, when the Government was in a state of embarrassment about supporting Walker and Henningsen, in and after their late invasion of Nicaragua, one of the Secretaries of State, Mr. Floyd, in a private interview with Henningsen, counselled the filibusters to let Nicaragua alone for the present, and turn to Mexico. As Henningsen did not quite see their way there, Mr. Floyd laid down their course for them. They should

enter the Mexican service, and find some opportunity, 'by 'some act, such as tearing down the flag of Spain,' to cause a war between Spain and Mexico, in pursuance of which Mexico might seize Cuba, which would then be at the disposal of the United States at any time. In return for this service, the Government would promote Walker's objects in Nicaragua. When Henningsen inquired about security and funds, the Minister observed that he had now 'gone to the end of his 'tether, and must obtain instructions before he could say more.' At a second interview, funds were promised; and the filibusters went to Mexico. They were not acceptable there; and when they reported their failure at Washington, they met with no adequate favour. Walker declared himself by this circumstance set free to explain his pertinacity in invading Nicaragua, which indeed the American public considered abundantly accounted for by the pledges he had received from Mr. Buchanan's Cabinet. The narrative was so consistent with the Ostend Manifesto, and with Mr. Buchanan's avowed line of policy, that it was believed by large classes of society least disposed in favour of Walker and his enterprises. It is unfortunate for the President's reputation that Walker still pushed on his piratical career. Almost before the British jurisdiction ceased in the island of Ruatan, Walker had landed there with his band of rogues and dupes; and he since menaced Nicaragua, of which he claims to be the disposer, and Truxillo. The 'Mobile Register,' and other Southern journals which assume to represent his 'cause,' announced his intention of establishing in Central America 'a Slaveholding Republic, that will encourage 'and legalise the importation of Africans.' Walker's own avowed purpose, publicly explained to his supporters in the Southern States, was to make of Nicaragua a 'Government that would 'aid in reopening the slave-trade, and become their firm, ser- 'viceable, and natural ally.' These schemes however are at an end, now that intelligence has arrived of the discomfiture of the adventurer, and even of his execution; and the world will be curious to see what sort of notice will be taken of his memory by those who once patronised his scandalous enterprises.

American newspapers in the interval have contained tidings and comments on 'the situation,' which are perhaps more important than anything yet said since Walker was known to be organising this latest expedition. We are told that the Government shows 'entire indifference' on the subject,—which means that the Government is taking no notice; and fierce indignation is expressed that Mr. Buchanan has so treated Nicaragua as to hand her over to the protection of Eng-

land. Nicaragua has made every possible advance to the United States Government to obtain security against invasion; but Mr. Buchanan either would not, or could not, do his duty by his neighbour: so that after waiting longer than could have been expected, Nicaragua has made an alliance with England, and published the treaty of February last, which secures to the transit route, and the State which contains it, the protection of Great Britain. 'The Monroe doctrine is abandoned, and can 'never again be invoked,' say these journals. 'We have no 'foreign policy,—not even for our own continent.' Meantime, Mr. Buchanan has had no eyes for Walker's proceedings.

We will not enter into the perplexed subject of Mexico. There is no attempt at concealing the general expectation that the whole of Mexico will be absorbed, when convenient, as some of her provinces have already been. On the whole, however, we hear somewhat less of the scheme of aggression on neighbours than for some time past. The tremendous sectional strife at home, and the consequences of a retrograde method of rule, as shown in the troubled state of all the outlying regions of the Republic, are now too grave to be put out of sight by new schemes of glory and plunder: and the next President will have enough upon his hands, without undertaking to conquer more worlds. The unorganised condition of Kansas, the unsettled troubles with the Mormons, the Indian wars throughout the far western territories, the chaos of blood and confusion in Texas, the responsibility of the filibustering in Central America, and the incessant bickering about Cuba, are quite enough for any President to have the charge of, without any schemes of further territorial aggrandisement. Meantime, the facts afford a singular commentary on Mr. Buchanan's professions about the 'calm' which was to prevail, and a very vivid illustration of the Monroe doctrine which was to govern his rule.

VIII. Our readers will not need to be reminded of some trouble of our own about a boundary; but we shall avoid any mere superficial discussion of it while the controversy remains undecided. The officer who is now undergoing his trial at Washington for his conduct at San Juan ought never to have had the power to make such a disturbance as he repeatedly caused. General Harney, when Major Harney, was declared by a coroner's jury the murderer of two slaves at St. Louis; and the details of the torture he inflicted with his own hands are so fearful that it is incomprehensible how he could ever have been entrusted with such military power as he held. The venerable General Scott did what he could to neutralise and repair the mischief of the

aggression at San Juan; and General Harney is at length called to account; but not till the risk of a collision between two great countries had been incurred over and over again, and the misfortune averted only by an admirable command of temper on the part of the British authorities. The Boundary question is not settled yet; and this will be another responsibility for the next President. It is earnestly to be desired that, during the interval, the history of the North-eastern Boundary question, as given by Mr. Grattan in the work which lies before us, should be studied by the people of the United States, as well as by all functionaries on either side likely to be engaged in the conduct of any similar controversy. It is a work of considerable value as a whole, conveying as it does the impressions of a European citizen after a long residence in Boston and elsewhere as British Consul; impressions which have an air of thorough honesty and good nature; but the part which will have the greatest and the longest value to both countries will probably be the three chapters of the first volume, which give an authoritative account of the most important controversy which had ever arisen between England and the United States. We occasionally see, still, some mention of what are called the exaggerations of those who denounce the frauds of that negotiation: but we should hear no more of exaggeration, or perhaps of delays and difficulties on the San Juan question, if the true story of Lord Ashburton's mission, as it stands undisputed in Mr. Grattan's work on 'Civilised America' had been read by the American people who hold the honour and welfare of their country in their own hands.

'IX. In following the course of Mr. Buchanan's term of office we next arrive at an event which shows (as some incident always does show in times of crisis) through how narrow a sluice an over-mastering deluge may begin to flow.

Our readers may perhaps have a vague impression that the name of Helper is familiar to their eyes, if not to their minds; for it is a name which has been uttered many millions of times within three years. It is known in this country, where known at all, from the circumstance that the election for Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington last winter was protracted for weeks and months on some question about Mr. Helper. It was really so; and it was Mr. Helper's book which finally discomfited the advocates of silence on the Slavery question, including Mr. Buchanan. In his Messages, Mr. Buchanan had propounded the truth that human opinions and desires, and social controversies, are subject to change; and that men often find themselves in a

state of indifference about matters which once excited their emotions and passions. Thus, he promised, the sectional conflict about Slavery would turn out harmless if the citizens could but hold their tongues about it, and turn their minds away from it. He spoke of it as of a transient ailment which needs only silent waiting to pass off: but the advice, at such a juncture, was like counselling a man to ignore an aneurism near the heart because a headache goes off next day.

Mr. Helper's book presently showed that the proposed issue was impossible, and why; and, as a natural consequence, it has been the particular means, in a case where some means would at all events have been found, of bringing the controversy to a crisis, altering the course of politics in both sections of the Union, and radically affecting the present Presidential election.

Mr. Hinton Rowan Helper is a Southern man, descended from ancestors who held landed property in North Carolina above a century ago. He honestly and simply tells his readers that his family has partly shared the fate of most of the landless whites of the Slave States, — sinking lower every year from the rank of the planter to something worse than is ever experienced by the humblest citizens of the Free States. From generation to generation his family has sunk in fortune, in social position, and in education. He himself is obviously not an educated man, though with sense enough to perceive, feeling enough to resent, and courage enough to complain of the injury. By some irresistible social pressure he found himself depressed and degraded. He set to work to find out the reason, and, having found it, he has braved all consequences to make his convictions known to those whom they most concern. It may be remembered by some of our readers that, among the outrages committed in Congress during Mr. Buchanan's term, one was on a stranger named Helper, who was knocked down and beaten in the Capitol. It was this Hinton Rowan Helper; and it was on account of this book: and that assault was, if the newspapers have followed his course with any accuracy, far from being his only suffering for his courage in publishing his work. On opening it, a reader would think it impossible that a man could be persecuted for such a book; for it is full of statistical facts and tabular statements: but the same spirit which moved the Brahmin to break the microscope which showed him what he did not wish to see, and which made Galileo's enemies refuse to look at the moon and planets through a telescope, caused the fellow-citizens of Mr. Helper to fall into rage with columns of figures, and rail at government returns as at works of heresy or licentiousness. The argument of a book which will have a

singular kind of immortality of its own, may be best judged of by an extract from the first chapter. The reader must understand that the value of the work is by no means in its style, and that the 'we' means 'I.'

'What we mean to do is simply this: to take a survey of the relative position and importance of the several States of this confederacy, from the adoption of the national compact; and when, of two sections of the country starting under the same auspices, and with equal natural advantages, we find one rising to a degree of almost unexampled power and eminence, and the other sinking into a state of comparative imbecility and obscurity, it is our determination to trace out the causes which have led to the elevation of the former and the depression of the latter, and to use our most earnest and honest endeavours to utterly extirpate whatever opposes the progress and prosperity of any portion of the Union.

'This survey we have already made; we have also instituted impartial comparisons between the cardinal sections of the country, north, south, east, and west; and as a true-hearted Southerner, whose ancestors have resided in North Carolina between one and two hundred years, and as one who would rather have his native clime excel than be excelled, we feel constrained to confess that we are deeply abashed and chagrined at the disclosures of the comparisons thus instituted. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution in 1789, we commenced an even race with the North. All things considered, if either the North or the South had the advantage, it was the latter.' (*Impending Crisis of the South*, p. 7.)

After exhibiting the proofs of this, Mr. Helper presents us with the present relations, in material concerns, between the two sections:—

'It is a fact well known to every intelligent Southerner that we are compelled to go to the North for almost every article of utility and adornment, from matches, shoe-pegs and paintings up to cotton-mills, steamships, and statuary; that we have no foreign trade, no princely merchants nor respectable artists; that, in comparison with the Free States, we contribute nothing to the literature, polite arts, and inventions of the age; that, for want of profitable employment at home, large numbers of our native population find themselves necessitated to emigrate to the West, whilst the Free States retain not only the larger proportion of those born within their own limits, but induce, annually, hundreds of thousands of foreigners to settle and remain amongst them; that almost everything produced at the North meets with ready sale; while, at the same time there is no demand, even among our own citizens, for the productions of Southern industry; that, owing to the absence of a proper system of business amongst us, the North becomes, in one way or another, the proprietor and dispenser of all our floating wealth, and that we are dependent on Northern capitalists for the means necessary to build our railroads, canals, and other public improvements; that if we want to visit a foreign

country, even though it may lie directly south of us, we find no convenient way of getting there except by taking passage through a northern port; and that nearly all the profits arising from the exchange of commodities, from insurance and shipping offices, and from the thousand and one industrial pursuits of the country, accrue to the North, and are there invested in the erection of those magnificent cities and stupendous works of art which dazzle the eyes of the South, and attest the superiority of free institutions!' (P. 12.)

Here follows a long inventory of commodities for which the South depends on the North, ending with the view of the contrast entertained by a Southern citizen:—

'But it can hardly be necessary to say more in illustration of this unmanly and unnational dependence, which is so glaring that it cannot fail to be apparent to even the most careless and superficial observer. All the world sees, or ought to see, that in a commercial, mechanical, manufactural, financial, and literary point of view, we are as helpless as babes; that, in comparison with the Free States, our agricultural resources have been greatly exaggerated, misunderstood, and mismanaged; and that, instead of cultivating among ourselves a wise policy of mutual assistance and co-operation with respect to individuals, and of self-reliance with respect to the South at large, instead of giving countenance and encouragement to the industrial enterprises projected among us, and instead of building up, aggrandising, and beautifying our own states, cities, and towns, we have been spending our substance at the North, and are daily augmenting and strengthening the very Power which now has us so completely under its thumb.

'It thus appears, in view of the preceding statistical facts and arguments, that the South, at one time the superior of the North in almost all the ennobling pursuits and conditions of life, has fallen far behind her competitor, and now ranks more as the dependency of a mother country than as the equal confederate of free and independent States.' (Pp. 13, 14.)

All this being too true to be denied, the only thing to be done was to suppress the testimony. For some time scarcely anything was heard of the book: and its author might reasonably fear that his neighbours would not profit by it as he had intended. The 'mean whites' are not a reading class; and it is easy to keep knowledge out of their reach. At length the facts collected by Mr. Helper became repeated in the Free States; the book went through several editions, and a plan was laid for circulating it in such a way that it might get into every house in the country. A subscription was instituted for circulating hundreds of thousands of the condensed work at a nominal price. Our readers will now remember that the delay in the election of the Speaker, and in the consequent organisation of Congress last winter, turned upon the resolution that no

person who had subscribed to, or had aided the circulation of, Helper's book should fill the office. During the many weeks of the struggle the Southern members poured out all they had to say about their grievances and discontents, while the Northern members were dumb. The latter had insisted that Congress not being organised before the Speaker was chosen, no member had a right to speak on any other subject than the election and the question of adjournment; and they therefore sat for many irksome hours listening to very gross reviling without being able to reply. They gained the day at last, chiefly through the anxiety of the Government to obtain suspended appropriations for the Post-office and other departments; and at length both sides had been heard. All that was said by all other speakers was of small account in comparison with Mr. Sumner's speech on the Barbarism of Slavery. 'It so happens that no other exposition of the kind exists for use; — no other complete exposure of the necessary operation of slavery, as proved by the hard facts on which all social calculations proceed. The information, derived from unquestionable sources, such as government returns of every sort, was afforded at a critical moment, and cannot but be of the highest use in deciding upon the new arrangements under which the Union must exist, if it is to subsist at all.

X. The crisis was, indeed, a grave one. The invasion of Virginia by John Brown had taken place; and the character and issue of that invasion justified a strong persuasion that there was more behind than the whole amount of what had appeared. It is scarcely conceivable that the invaders should have attempted what they did with so few resources as they disclosed; rumours were all abroad of further forces being in ambush everywhere, which accident had prevented from arriving in time: and the excessive panic to which slaveholding societies are always subject, spread from Maryland to Texas, and from Florida to Arkansas. Among an infinity of portents, two were grave beyond all estimate. The Federal Senate exceeded its constitutional powers in enforcing its pleasure on citizens of various States; and the Slave States threw off all semblance of obedience to law and regard to constitutional rights. In order to judge of the character of the latter part of Mr. Buchanan's administration, it is necessary to advert to two or three of the chief incidents of the time.

The Harper's Ferry insurrection, as we are too apt to call the invasion of a sovereign State by the citizens of other States, took place in November, as if by way of appeal to Congress to do its duty, and to keep the authorities up to theirs. The ag-

gression was of so utterly unjustifiable and absurd a character (notwithstanding the lofty qualities of John Brown who led it), that it ought not to have occasioned much embarrassment; still less any lapse into a worse lawlessness than before. Virginia was abundantly able to deal with the handful of invaders; and the discredit reflected upon abolitionism by a few champions of the slaves who represented nobody but themselves, might have given a real triumph both to Virginia and to the general Government, if they had been wise. It is true, the Abolitionists proper are, for the most part, non-resistants, and altogether opposed to the machinery of plots, secret societies, or any other procedure than an open exhibition of the duties of men to each other, and the rights of the inhabitants of the country in which they live: but they would have been more or less put upon their defence, as to their character and honour, if other people had done right. Instead of this, the Senate at once proceeded to do things that it had no right to do. On pretext of inquiry, a committee of its members, while passing over the witnesses in Virginia, summoned citizens of Massachusetts, New York, and other States, who could not be reasonably supposed to have any connexion whatever with the attempt of John Brown; and, if any one demurred to the summons, sent officers to seize the recusant. If a citizen who had answered to the summons declined, on legal advice, to reply to certain questions, they committed him to gaol for contempt. One excellent citizen was presently flying over the frontier in one direction, and another in another. Some went into hiding, some to Canada, and some to Europe, having reason to know that their lives would not be safe if they put themselves in the power of unscrupulous authorities at a time of excitement amounting to popular madness. One of these so-called witnesses, a wealthy citizen of New York, named Thaddeus Hyatt, was in prison at Washington during the session, sustained by the Northern members, and guided by the best legal advice. He really knew nothing of Brown's enterprise; and, with this advantage, he was able to baffle the committee by telling them nothing that they wanted to know, but everything that he wanted to say. His portrait, and an engraving of his prison-room, flew all over the country; and at length, when Congress broke up, and the hot weather came on, and Hyatt's health was reported to be injured, he was quietly dismissed from prison,—victorious, of course. There was a yet graver case,—more damaging to the authority and reputation of the Senate. Its agents hung about the town of Concord, in Massachusetts,—Emerson's place of abode,—to arrest a citizen named

Sanborn, a schoolmaster, who, under legal advice, had omitted, like some of his neighbours, to go to Washington. This went on through March, till, becoming impatient, the committee of the Senate sent the necessary papers to the United States Marshal, and commanded him to arrest Sanborn. 'The officers sent to Concord for the purpose obtained entrance to Mr. Sanborn's house at night by a *ruse*, and found the schoolmaster in study-gown and slippers. They dragged him out of the house, after putting on handcuffs, and tried to force him into a carriage: but his sister and his pupils made an outcry, knocked at all the doors in the street, took possession of the steps of the carriage, and whipped the horses; so that the citizens collected before the captors could dispose of their prize. Sanborn held up his hands, and the gleam of the lights on his fetters did not mollify men's minds. He was carried back to his house in triumph. The actions at law which arose out of this affair issued in victory to the constitutional party in Massachusetts. The arrest was declared illegal by the Chief Justice, in the name of the whole Court. The universal expectation was that the attempt would be renewed in a more legal manner: and, the old revolutionary spirit being fairly roused, it became the settled purpose of the citizens to stand by their State-rights, and permit no citizen of Massachusetts to be carried off where his liberty would no longer be under the protection of the laws of his own State. It is well understood that such measures were taken as would have made it a grave affair for the Senate to have persisted. The Concord schoolmaster has thus far been wisely left in peace.

The condition of the country, in its Northern section, did not by this time bear witness to the calming effects of the Dred Scott decision, or to the success of Mr. Buchanan's policy, avowedly grounded upon it. The affair of Kansas remained unsettled; long trains of pilgrims were seeking the graves of John Brown and his sons; arrangements were making for resisting the aggressions of the Senate; there was plenty of both legislation and action against the new pro-slavery laws, with occasional escapes of good citizens from gaol, a profusion of public meetings, with speeches which quickened the blood of old men, in memory of revolutionary days; and, amidst the excitement, there was a steady and rapid growth of the Republican party, which has now charged itself with the ancient liberties of the Republic.

In the South, things were done which we cannot ask our readers to dwell upon. A stern and concise history of the 'Reign of Terror of 1859 and 1860,' lies before us, containing

much that is too shocking for extract. It must suffice that no distinction was made between Yankee, Scotchman, Irishman, or German; but every stranger was dogged, suspected, and more or less persecuted. Governesses and schoolmistresses were expelled from their abodes, or turned back on their road to their situations, merely because they were supposed to be of Northern origin. Commercial travellers were searched, and pointed out to public suspicion; and two had half their heads and beards shaved, and were sent away, after a scourging, by the train, attended to the station by a jeering mob. The scourgings (by an insane imprudence inflicted by negroes) of artisans, ministers of religion, hawkers of goods, and others; and the tarring and feathering, the ducking, the hideous mock processions to exhibit the victim to indignity and ill-usage, are abundantly sickening: but there are worse things still. The executions, not only without trial, and without pause, but without a tittle of evidence, or the smallest ground for suspicion, mark the period as revolutionary in the most fearful sense of the word: but there is still something worse. Most of us have read in the newspapers the story of the humble New England book hawker who was in Texas last spring with his cart and literary wares; and that he unhappily came by when a negro was caught in the supposed intention of running away; and that the panic-stricken wretch was asked, under hope of his life being spared, to name, the person who tempted him to escape; and that he pointed out the first person he saw, who happened to be the itinerant bookseller; and that the cart and cargo were overturned and smeared with tar, and made into a pile for the burning of their owner; and that none but the executioners could bear to stay within hearing when the fire had begun to do its work. The story has been ascertained to be too true; and it is but too clear a token of the lawlessness exhibited by the Slave States towards the close of Mr. Buchanan's term of rule.

The precise condition of the country over which the new President will have to rule, may be best understood by a careful reading of Mr. Sumner's speech. Mr. Everett's oration is intended to represent it; but not, as in Mr. Sumner's case, for practical purposes. On the 4th of July the citizens are to be made jubilant, at all costs; and in this year 1860, England is to be drawn away from any close observation of the urgent difficulties which bring Mr. Everett himself into the field as a candidate for office. The oration, therefore, exhibits the progress made in eighty years by the young Republic, without any hint of half the States having retrograded in all ways, while

the vast achievements which the orator celebrates are wholly due to the Free States. How far the picture, as presented to gratify the complacency of the day, is correct, a few facts will show; and they are facts which it is necessary to understand if the nature of the Presidential appointment is to be comprehended in Europe.

The Slave States are larger than the Free by 238,000 square miles, and they enjoy a climate superior at all seasons, and for all purposes. They have fifty navigable rivers always open, and many excellent harbours. In 1790, when the first census was taken, the population of the Northern and Southern section was equal, within a few thousands; but now, notwithstanding the large accessions of territory in the South, its white population is little more than one-third that of the North. Excluding property in slaves, the wealth of the North is nearly treble that of the South; but as the pecuniary value of slaves passes at once into the land on their emancipation, we may place that item to the credit of the Slave States; and then their wealth will be somewhat less than half that of the Free States. In regard to agriculture, which is the pride of the South, the contrast is remarkable. Every acre and every husbandman in the North produces twice as much as in the South; so that now the annual hay crop alone of the Free States exceeds in value the total produce of the South, including cotton, tobacco, sugar, and farm crops of every kind. The manufactures of Massachusetts alone exceeded last year those of the entire range of Slave States in which various factories have been set up within a few years, in the vain hope of employing the slaves profitably in them. In commerce the case is the same. Throwing out New York, on the one hand, and admitting New Orleans on the other, the supremacy of the North is astonishing, the tonnage of Massachusetts alone exceeding that of the collective Slave States. Last year, Maine alone built more shipping than the whole South. The imports and exports of New York alone were last year larger than those of not only Virginia, once the leading State, but of all the Southern ports together. Railroads and canals go with the industry and commerce, and both show three times the length in the North that they have in the wide levels of the South, so favourable to their formation. No Slave State pays for its mail transport, and the entire group does not pay one-third of the mail charge; whereas Massachusetts, after paying for herself, yields a surplus larger than the whole amount raised in South Carolina. Churches and charities follow the proportions of population, and the peculiarities of 'the domestic institution,' so that the inferiority of the South is a matter of

course. The church property of the South is less than one-third that of the North: and Massachusetts gives to the support of missions alone eight times the amount of charity afforded by open-handed South Carolina.

A more interesting group of facts, as regards the prospects of the Republic, is that which relates to education. The two sections were once so nearly equal in their apparatus of college education, that there are now only two more colleges in the Free than in the Slave States, — the number being sixty-one to fifty-nine: but the Slave States are educating 747 ministers of the Gospel, while the Free States educate that number, and nearly 10,000 more, viz. 10,702; and something of the same proportion is shown by the professional schools, where the South shows 3,812 students, to 23,513 in the North. In the free schools of the North, there is a larger proportion of the small, despised, free-negro element of the population, than there is in the South of the dominant white population. There are nearly three millions of pupils in the one section, to little more than half a million in the other: and the difference is not compensated for by private schools, which are everywhere inferior to those of the North. As for the press, South Carolina, which leads the march of intelligence in the South, and is five times as large as Massachusetts, had, at the last census, 141 printers, and not one publisher, to the 1,229 printers and fifty-nine publishers of Massachusetts. Of authors, South Carolina had two, and Massachusetts seventeen. 'Duyckink's Cyclopedia of American 'Literature' shows 403 authors in the Free, to 87 in the Slave, States. Patents of inventions are seven times as numerous in the Northern as in the Southern section. In the South, with its small white population, there are half a million of adults unable to read, to less than a quarter of a million in the vast and heterogeneous white population of the North. The statistics of migration are very striking, after all we hear of the hosts of Northern men who disperse themselves over the South and West: for it appears that six times as many in proportion to the population pass over from the Slave States to the Free as the reverse.

These facts are enough to show that the alienation of the two sections of the Union is not, as Mr. Buchanan assumes, a passing mood of irritation, nor, as Mr. Everett urges, a disagreeable topic which good breeding would ignore. On the one hand, there is wrath and disgust that the inferior section should overrule the superior in the whole course of the policy of the Republic; and on the other, there is fear, mortification, and envy in the sinking section, at the strength and growth of the rising

Free States. We see in Southern newspapers white and black lists of Northern mercantile firms, the members of which are set down by guess as pro or anti-slavery: and some of these firms are known to subsidise the newspapers, in order to preserve their trade. Agents are constantly busy in New York collecting these bribes. The mails are searched for matter of an incendiary (anti-slavery) character. Vigilance Committees are in full activity in scores of towns, watching over trade and professions, and summarily expelling every shopkeeper, teacher, artisan, and even clergyman and physician, whose opinions are suspected. In the case of 'the Bereans' (inhabitants of Berea, in Kentucky) thirty-six have been driven out of the State *en masse*—pastor, landowners, traders, and labourers together, more than half of whom were native citizens. The dreadful story of the scourging of the aged clergyman, Mr. M'Kinney, and of a comrade, in the presence of their wives, last April, must be fresh in the memory of our readers. Mr. M'Kinney is a Kentucky man, approving of slavery, but moved by his experience to preach against cruelty in the treatment of negroes. No man is safe from eaves-dropping and denunciation in any Southern settlement; and there are newspapers which venture to ask whether any espionnage in Paris, Vienna, or St. Petersburg can be more irksome than that of the Slave States, or half so dangerous to life, liberty, and fortune. In Texas, thirteen towns and villages have recently been fired in one afternoon. Sixty persons have been summarily hanged without trial. Two of these were charged with having supplied a hundred bottles of strychnine to negroes, wherewith to poison the wells. One of the narrowest escapes was perhaps that of Mr. Savers, a New Orleans merchant of twenty years' standing, and therefore safe, if any man could be. He was suspected of being 'an emissary of the 'abolitionists' (a fabulous order of agents altogether), and he had the rope about his neck, when he made the masonic sign, and was saved. The stupid and monstrous terrors of the slaveholders are both cause and effect of the existing anarchy. Two years ago a Wesleyan Conference was broken up and its members driven away from Texas, on suspicion of some objection to slavery. It was assumed that the Wesleyans must be vindictive after this; traces of their malice were looked for; rumours naturally arose; and panic grew out of the rumours. Then came torture to induce confession, and public murders to gratify passion and assert power. What follows murder is always plain. When the planters had begun hanging Wesleyan ministers (one of their latest acts), they ought not to have been surprised (however aghast) at any extent of incendiary fires on

their estates. On the frontier, kidnapping, not of negroes or mulattos only, is increasing to a frightful extent. We will stop here, for tales of horror are not needed. It is enough to say, in accounting for the hostility between the two sections, that in the North there are families and communities mourning the imprisonment of such men as Captain Baylis, who is wearing out his term of forty years in the Penitentiary, for five negro slaves having been found on board his ship in the Delaware: or the disappearance of some relative or fellow-citizen who has been kidnapped, and carried no one knows whither; or some friend, father, or brother, hanged or burned alive under a mistake, in too great a hurry to admit of his explaining who he was. On the other hand, the slaveholders are suffering agonies under the delusions which beset their class. They see in every negro a murderer, in every stranger a spy, and in every move of any State, and in every opposition speech in Congress, a conspiracy to destroy them. The North protests against the pro-slavery legislation of late years, and supplies an organisation to agitate for the dissolution and reconstitution of the Union: and at the same time several Southern States are openly proposing to secede from the Union, and establish a new Federation for themselves. It is not our intention to comment on these facts. We simply present them as features of the society which the new President will have to rule, and as evidences of the ill-success of Mr. Buchanan's policy of favouring the dominant minority, and 'crying peace, when there is no peace.'

In considering the prospects and the duty of the new President, we must remember two things above all others: and first, that the power of the American President is, if short in duration, very strong in quality; if he rules for only four or eight years, it is ruling in earnest, if he so pleases. Next, we must remember that there is no question in the case of the abolition of slavery. The Central Government has no immediate concern with the institution, except as it exists in the district of ten miles square which is under the jurisdiction of Congress. The separate Sovereign States have their own policy and their own institutions; and the part of the Washington Government is to promote the free action of the whole nation in conducting its collective affairs, and not to interfere with the respective States. Thus far, recent Presidents have lent their whole force to the attempt to spread the fatal institution of slavery over the whole Union; and the question now is whether this policy shall be pushed forward or reversed. This alternative has swallowed up all political subdivisions, and has left the stage clear for the conflict of the Democratic and Repub-

lican parties on a definite question. If there is nominally a third combatant just now — the Union party — it is an ephemeral phenomenon, bred of the passions of the time, and with no capacity of long life or practical vigour. While the contest is one which involves every principle and aim of the founders of the Republic, and every one of the liberties bequeathed by them to their posterity, the Union party proposes peace at any price, insists on silence about subjects of discontent, hopes to make all right by protesting that there is nothing wrong; and suggests, as the proper remedy for the universal discontent, a cherishing of that love for the Union and the Constitution which existed before slavery, and the oligarchy which sustains it, had broken up the balance of the one and the bearings of the other. The Union party is so manifestly inadequate to the requirements of the time that it seems to be used merely as a contingent which may determine the victory of the one or the other party. The Union candidate, Mr. Bell, and his subordinate partner, Mr. Everett, can have no expectation of success, and are evidently using their temporary importance to improve the chance of the Democratic candidate, in the hope that the North will not stir, if the fractious South can be humoured.

We will not draw our readers into any of the intricacies of political movement, while awaiting the result in the election of this autumn. It is universally known that the Democratic party, deeply divided before, gave way altogether at the Charleston Convention; and that the slaveholders who do not look beyond preserving slavery or perishing in the attempt to secede from the Union have nominated a candidate in the person of Mr. Breckinridge. This movement is mere detriment to the cause of Mr. Douglas. Whether it is as fatal as it is supposed to be to Mr. Douglas's election, or whether the junction of the Union party with his own will win the day, a short time will show. Meantime, there can be no doubt of the vast growth of the Republican party under the stimulus of Mr. Buchanan's misrule. In declaring for political honesty and official purity, and for an orderly reversal of the unconstitutional steps of recent years, the Republican party has enlisted most of the moral force of the nation, though few enlightened and patriotic men believe that any political party can now retrieve the Commonwealth, and the difficulties of the situation appear to be too great for any candidate. Mr. Seward, regarded as the ablest candidate for nomination, broke down under the difficulty of even addressing the nation he thought of governing. While speaking in the North, as at Rochester, he was clear, bold,

animated and animating; but at Washington, with mere dislocation for his stand-point, he lost his footing, and presently after disappeared in the chasm which it must require the highest order of statesman to bridge over, supposing such an achievement possible. Now he has recovered himself in virtue of being an advocate of another man, instead of himself a candidate. His recent speech at Detroit reminds us of the Seward of two years ago. Mr. Lincoln, of fair fame in his own State, and not unknown in Congress, as a shrewd and sensible politician of a homely sort, prudently keeps quiet, as Mr. Bell does, while their rival, Mr. Douglas, is 'stumping the States.' Mr. Lincoln would gain nothing by personal canvassing; by staying at home he avoids the difficulty of conciliating irreconcilable parties, while the object of his nomination secures the activity of his supporters. He is put forward by the ambition of the great Northwest, which wants to send a President to Washington, as North and South have so often done. Mr. Douglas needs no description. 'The little giant,' as his friends call him, has made his own impression on all observers of Mr. Buchanan's administration; and the prospect of his succession is not a bright or reassuring one, on any ground, notwithstanding his secession from the President's party. He has excited disgust by going about, speaking and canvassing on his own behalf. Governors of States have occasionally put forth their claims in person; but this is the first time in the history of the Republic that the office of its Chief Magistrate has been so dragged in the mire. Mr. Douglas is probably as sincere as any prominent public man who has quitted the ethical basis on which the great Republic was grounded; but, having quitted it to follow a questionable trail, he can scarcely satisfy the highest order of expectation, on either side of the Atlantic.

It would require so great a man to establish even a working agreement between the warring sections of the nation that it would be unreasonable to anticipate so much as even a temporary accommodation. Washington himself never had so hard a task before him as to govern a group of enlightened and a group of half-barbarous sovereign States at the same moment and by a common policy. The 'irrepressible conflict' indicated by Mr. Seward must be encountered and dealt with in one way or another. 'The Slave Statesmen persist in supposing this to mean civil war thrust upon the South by a tyrannical majority in the North; while the North always understood the expression to refer to the eternal opposition of the principles of free and despotic institutions. The man who might so preside over the struggle as to bring it to a favourable issue would be the

true comrade of Washington. Such a man is nowhere recognised at present. In his absence, a multitude of citizens doing their duty faithfully may in part compensate for the want.

What is that duty, in a special sense? To us it seems very clear. The Republican State was founded on a moral basis. Every one of the great men who put a hand to the work had the hope that long generations of citizens would be better and happier than the men of Europe, because more free. To make the nation better and happier than they could otherwise be was the aim; and the means chosen for the purpose were, in the first place, truths moral and political, laid down as the basis of the new polity. The worst symptom of the existing condition of affairs is that very few of the citizens,—or very few of those whose views and actions become known to us,—adhere to this basis at all. If a large number in the South have arrived at approving of slavery, instead of regarding it as the misfortune and disgrace which they once considered it, so also do multitudes of so-called anti-slavery men in the North overlook the moral decline of the national spirit for the sake of glorying in its material prospects. Here and there a preacher, or orator, or grey-haired patriot speaks to the citizens of the decline of their commercial honour, of the growth of a barbaric ambition, of the merging of the ancient strength into modern passion and restlessness, and of the spread of an unscrupulous vanity and egotism over the ruins of the piety and devotedness in which their fathers lived; but the voice of warning is at once put down by a burst of boasting. There are bad people in every nation, the boasters say, and not more in their country than in others; every polity has its dark side; and there is no patriotism in making the worst of it. Their nation is the first in the world, in its prospects at least. It will get over its sins and their consequences; and then,—it will carry the whole world before it, and hold the first place in history for ever. If this humour of vanity could ever become universal, all would be over with the Republic. The hope is in there being true patriots enough to keep their country up to the original mark, or to bring it back to the principles of mutual good faith and common liberty which saved it, in its first feebleness, from the scoffs of the proud old world of Europe, and which alone can now reinstate it in the cordial respect of the human race.

No. CCXXIX. will be published early in January, 1861.

INDEX.

A

About, Edmund, La Question Romaine, reviewed, 104.
Atkinson, T. W., his Oriental and Western Siberia, and Travels in the Regions of the Upper and Lower Amoor, reviewed, 295.

B

Baker, C. T., his 'Sources of the Nile,' reviewed, 295.
Brain Difficulties, 526—incipient stages, 528—diseases of memory, 529—physical cause of insanity, 538—sleep, 539—dreams, 541—unconscious cerebration, 542—morbid attention, 543—treatment, 544.
Brooks, Shirley, his 'Russians of the South,' reviewed, 175.
Buchan, History of, by Pratt, 522.
Burton, R. F., his 'Lake Regions of Central Africa,' reviewed, 295.

C

Chevalier, De la Baisse probable de l'Or, reviewed, 1. See *Gold*.
Churches of the Holy Land, 423—church of the Holy Sepulchre, 424—Mr. Fergusson's theory, 425—Khubbet-es-Sakrah, 430—article in Dr. Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible,' 437—church of Bethlehem, 441—De Vogüé and Willis on the Sepulchre, 446—church of the Crusaders, 449—Latin archæology, 450—Iconoclasm, 453—architecture of Western Europe, 454—Romanesque and Gothic architecture, 455.

D

D'Azeglio, Marquis, his 'Court of Rome and the Gospel,' reviewed, 104.
D'Haussonville, 'Histoire de la Réunion de la Lorraine à la France,' reviewed, 59.
Dolgoroukow, Prince Pierre, 'La Vérité sur la Russie,' reviewed, 175.
Domenech, Abbé Em., his 'Seven Years' Residence in the Great Deserts of North America,' reviewed, 295.
Dumbartonshire, History of, by J. Irving, 513.

E

English History, Revolutions in, 136—what has 'made England to be England,' 138—Dr. Vaughan's mistakes, 139—ecclesiastical affairs, 140—history of the Norman conquest, 143—foreign

matters, *ib.* — 'Ionia,' 144 — struggle for investiture, 146 — criticism on Lord Macaulay, *ib.* — Plantagenet England, 150 — English history from the 13th century, 152 — England compared with France and Germany, 153 — church of the 15th century, 157 — effect of the Norman-conquest, 159.

Everett, Hon. E., his 'Oration at Boston,' reviewed, 515.

F

Fergusson, James, his 'Essay on the Ancient Topography of Jerusalem,' reviewed, 423.

Forster, John, 'Debates on the Grand Remonstrance, Nov. and 'Dec. 1641, with an Introductory Essay on English Freedom 'under Plantagenet and Tudor Sovereigns,' reviewed, 460 — his 'Arrest of the Five Members,' and 'Historical and Biographical 'Essays,' reviewed, 460.

G

Geographical Researches, recent, 295 — ancient geography, 302 — modern discoveries, 303 — oceans, 308 — north-polar enterprise, 309—south-polar, 311 — Europe, 312—Asia, 313—Russian settlements, 314 — Chinese Tartary, 316—China Proper, 317—Persia, Turkey, 318—Arabia, 319—Africa, *ib.* — the Nile, 322—Australia, 326 — islands of Indian Ocean, 328—Continent of the West, 329.

Geological Discoveries, 87 — 'Silurian System,' *ib.* — 'fundamental 'gneiss,' 89—newer gneiss, 93—fossils of Lesmahago, *ib.* — extent of Silurian deposits, 95 — Devonian group, 96—reptilian remains, 99—Permian series, 100.

Geological Map of the Highlands, 87.

Gold, probable fall in the value of, 1 — Mexico and Peru, *ib.* — California and Australia, 2 — influence of gold discoveries, *ib.* — 'probable fall in the value of gold,' 4—present state of gold production, 6 — 'demand for gold,' 10 — system of credit, 12 — currency in India, 13 — rate at which population is advancing and gold increasing, 14 — absorption of gold in the arts, 16 — present experience of the movement, 19—displacement of silver by gold, 21—currency of France, 22 — India, and China, 24 — effect on gold discoveries on the working classes, 25 — sufferers by impending monetary changes, 28 — distribution of wealth, 32 — means of lessening the evils of the crisis, 33.

Grand Remonstrance, the, Mr. Forster's Essay on, 460 — Sir S. D'Ewes, 461 — 'The Incident,' 464 — character of Grand Remonstrance, *ib.* — attempt on Pym's life, 468 — debates on the Remonstrance, 469—Palmer's protest, 470—Pym, 473 — Hampden, 475 —arrest of Five Members, 477—Hyde, 485—Falkland, 487.

Grattan, T. C., his Civilised America, reviewed, 545.

Grote, Mrs., her Memoir of the Life of Ary Scheffer, reviewed, 161.

Grotius '*de Jure Belli*,' 386 — Stewart, Hallam, and Mackintosh, 389 — history of the Law of Nations, 390 — heathen period, 400 —Christian, 402—Suarez, 404—Grotius' innovation, 405—Justice,

407 — the volunteer system, 412 — successors of Grotius, 413 — Dr. Phillimore, 415 — International Law the Criminal Law of States, 417.

H

Harcourt, Rev. Leveson Vernon, his Diaries and Correspondence of the Right Hon. George Rose, reviewed, 34. See *Rose*.

Helper, H. R., Impending Crisis of the South, reviewed, 545.

Hind, H. Y., his Narrative of an Expedition through the Southern Portion of Rupert's Land, from Lake Superior to near the foot of the Rocky Mountains, &c., reviewed, 295.

Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire, par M. A. Thiers, Vol. XVII., reviewed, 237.

Humboldt and Varnhagen von Ense, Correspondence of, 213 — extracts from Diaries, 216—Rahel, 219—'Cosmos,' 222 — Humboldt and the King, 223—Bunsen and Radowitz, 224—Humboldt's politics, 228 — account of England, 230 — letters about Kosmos, 234—Metternich, 235—Vienna Congress, 235.

I

Irving, J., his History of Dumbartonshire, reviewed, 489.

J

Jeffrey, Alexander, his History and Antiquities of Roxburghshire and adjacent districts, reviewed, 489.

K

Krapf, Rev. Dr. J. L., his Travels in Eastern Africa, reviewed, 295.

L

Laurent, F., his La Papauté et l'Empire, reviewed, 104.

Leighton, J. M., his History of the County of Fife, reviewed, 489.

Lorraine, union to France, 59—Lorraine in 1559, 60—reign of Charles III., 61—Charles IV.'s character, 65 — rupture with France, 66—Lorraine 'bridled,' 69—return of Charles IV., 71 —fresh rupture, 72—the Fronde, 73—Lorraine and Bar ceded, 75—career of Charles V., 77—his son Leopold restored, 80—his policy, 82—Francis, 84—Lorraine annexed, 85—D'Haussonville's remarks, *ib.*

M

Maguire, J. F., his Rome and its Rulers, reviewed, 104.

Maius, Angelus, Ἡ παλαια και ἡ καινη Διαθηκη. Vetus et Novum Testamentum ex antiquissimo codice Vaticano — and Ἡ καινη Διαθηκη. Novum Testamentum ex vetustissimo codice Vaticano, reviewed, 256. See *Vatican Codex*.

Mann, Dr. R. J., his Colony of Natal, reviewed, 295.

Mill, J., his Thoughts on Parliamentary Reform, reviewed, 266.

Müller, Max, his History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, 361.

Murchison, Sir R. I., his Siluria, reviewed, 87 — his Geological Structure of the North of Scotland, reviewed, 87.

N

Note Circulaire adressé par le Gouverne-Ent des Romagnes à ses Agents à l'Étranger, reviewed, 104.

P

Pape, le, et le Congrès, reviewed, 104

Patrimony of St. Peter, 104 — political functions of Bishop of Rome while subservient to the Empire, 105 — donation of Charlemagne, 109 — Gregory VII., 110 — donation of the Countess Matilda, 112 — temporal aggrandisement, 113 — the charter of Rodolph the real foundation of the Papal power, 114 — Avignon popes, 115 — Clement VII., 120 — war with Florence, *ib.* — rights suppressed, 121 — Duchies of Ferrara and Urbino annexed, 122 — Rome's title never recognised as having any spiritual sanction; 123 — effect of the temporal dominion, 127 — opinion of the people, 129 — indivisibility of the temporal and spiritual power, a fiction, 132.

Paterson, James, his History of the County of Ayr, reviewed, 489.

Phillimore, Dr. R., his Commentaries on International Law, reviewed, 386.

Pratt, Rev. J. B., his Buchan, reviewed, 488.

R

Robinson, Dr. E., his Latin Biblical researches in Palestine, reviewed, 423.

Rose, George, Diaries and Correspondence of, 34 — the Coalition Government, 35 — joins Pitt, 36 — Lord Percy's letter, *ib.* — French aggression upon Holland, 37 — Lord Grenville's despatch, *ib.* — The Catholic question in 1801, 39 — Pitt's opinion of a Suez Canal, 43 — negotiations with Addington, 44 — Pitt's second administration, *ib.* — Pitt, Fox, and Grenville, 45 — Rose's reflections, *ib.* — Rose's conversations with the King, 46 — Rose's character of Pitt, 51 — Administration of 1806, 53 — duel between Castlereagh and Canning, 54 — Perceval, 55 — Rose's conduct, 57.

Russia and Serf-Emancipation, 175—Prince Dolgoroukow's view of the Russia of to-day, 177—falsification of the aspect of Russian polity, 178—administration of justice, 180—military courts, 182—the Senate, 183—system on which public business is conducted, 186—military administration, 187—monetary crisis, 189—serfs and Temperance Societies, 192—institution of Russian serfage, 197—Catherine and Alexander I., 198—Nicholas's ukase of 1842, 201—Shirley Brook's account, 202—Alexander II.'s proclamation, 203—conditions of emancipation, 205—views of Wolowska, 207—Tourgueneff, 208—Dolgoroukow, 210.

Russland unter Alexander II., Nicolajewitsch, reviewed, 175.

S

Sandford, J. L., his Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion, reviewed, 460.

Sanskrit Literature, ... nt, 361—Vedas, *ib.*—Sutra period, 367—Chhandas, 368—... cal science, 369—classification of Veda literature, 373—Upa... probable era of the Brahmanas, 374—... society, 380—religion, 382—condition of ...

Scheffer, Ary, Memoir of the Life of, 161—his artistic rank, *ib.*—conspiracies, 162—Mrs. Grote's account of him in the 'three glorious days,' *ib.*—attachment to the art, 170—his works, 172—Princess Marie, 167—reception at the court, 170—his works, 172.

Scottish County Histories, 489—Sir R. Sibbald, *ib.*—Sir R. Gordon, 491—Scotstarvet, *ib.*—first Scotch map, 492—Sibbald's 'History of Fife,' 494—Leighton's Fife, 495—Jeffrey's Roxburghshire, 498—Pictish controversy, 501—Flemish colonisation, 503—Sheriffdom of Roxburgh, 504—coroners, 506—ecclesiastical antiquities, 507—disappearance of Jedburgh, 511—gipsies of Yetholm, 512—Irving's Dumbartonshire, 513—Roman engineering, 516—Cardross Household Book, 517—Dumbarton, 518—'Bonhill Genealogies,' 520—McAulay, 521—Pratt's Buchan, 522—'Sands of Forvee,' 523—Fraserburgh, 524—recent discovery, 525.

Secret Voting and Parliamentary Reform, 266—Mill on ballot, *ib.*—practical results of secret voting, 268—right of scrutiny, 274—ballot disposed of by imperfect syllogisms, 279—example of America, 283—Australia and France, 285—Parliamentary Reform, 288—Sir John Walsh's retrospect, *ib.*—Lord John Russell's discernment, 289—fate of Reform Bill, 291.

Sheahan, J. W., his Life of Stephen A. Douglas, reviewed, 545.

Sibbald, Sir R., his History, Ancient and Modern, of the Sheriffdoms of Fife and Kinross, &c., reviewed, 489.

Sinclair, John, Master of, his Memoirs of the Insurrection in Scotland in 1715, reviewed, 332—the '15, 333—Sinclair's chronicle, 334—Earl of Mar, 337—Ker of Kersland, 346—Lovat and the Covenanters, 349—Rob Roy, 350—Sir John Maclean, 351—Lord Breadalbane, 352—'Old Rag,' 353—Lord Duffus, 354—Jacobite army, 356.

Smith, Dr. W., his Dictionary of the Bible, reviewed, 423.

Sumner, Hon. C., his Speech on Admission of Kansas as a Free State, 545.

T

Thiers' History of the Consulate and Empire, 237—natural frontiers,' 240—arrangements of 1814, 245—negotiation of Frankfort, 246—conferences of Chatillon, 250—Thiers' aspirations, 255.

Tourgueneff, N., La Russie et les Russes, and Un Dernier Mot sur l'Emancipation des Serfs en Russie, reviewed, 175.

Transactions of the Royal Geographical Society for 1857—1859, reviewed, 295.

U

United States under Buchanan, 545—Oregon question, 547—Fugitive Slave Law, 549—Dred Scott's case, *ib.*—corruption of the

Democrats, 552—results of Buchanan's election, on Scott's case, 554—Kansas, 557—Mr. Douglas, 559—Cuba, 560—intended acquisition of Cuba, &c., 561—Nicaragua, 566—San Juan, 567—Mr. Grattan reviewed, &c.—Boundary, *ib.*—Mr. Helper, 568—relations of the Northern States, 569—election of Speaker, 571—Harper's position of the States, 572—condition of the country, 573—Brown's Fanatical Insurrection, 574—Slave States, 577—prospects of new Presidential election, 578—state of parties, 579.

Vatican Codex, 256—history of, 257—Sepulveda, *ib.*—Roman edition of 1586, 260—Collations, *ib.*—Mai's edition, 261—Vercellone's account of, 263—MS. found at Mount Sinai by Tischendorf, 265.

Vaughan, Dr. R., his Revolutions in English History, reviewed, 136.

Vogel, Dr. E., his Travels in Central Africa, noticed, 295.

Vogüé, Comte Melchior de, his Eglises de la Terre Sainte, reviewed, 423.

W

Walsh, Sir J., his Statistical Results of the Reform Act of 1832, reviewed, 266.

Whewell, Dr. W., his edition of Grotius De Jure Belli et Pacis, reviewed, 386.

Williams, George, his Holy City, reviewed, 423.

Willis, R., Architectural History of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, reviewed, 425.

Winslow, Dr. Forbes, his Obscure Diseases of the Brain, reviewed, 526.

Wolowski, M. L., La Question du Servage en Russie, reviewed, 175.

END OF VOL. CXII.

LONDON: PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. NEW-STREET SQUARE.